

To be chief quartermaster clerks

Alexander N. Entringer
Samuel G. Thompson

To be chief pay clerks

Emmett G. Hall
Charles T. Gates

To be chief marine gunner

Albert S. Munsch

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Robert E. Hamilton, Eloy.
Aurelio B. Sanchez, Sonora.

KENTUCKY

Sister Basil Pike, Maple Mount.

TEXAS

Annie Koon, Buchanan Dam.
Ova Richardson, Caddo.
Frank E. Schrack, Catarina.
Ruby M. Smith, Deweyville.
Joe P. Luce, Graford.
Mary E. Cummins, Grandfalls.
Thelma L. Thames, Monroe City.
Edward H. Reinhard, Poth.
Martha Iduma McDonald, Santo.
Mary E. Featherhoff, Velasco.
Pearl B. Monke, Weinert.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with whom time and space are nothing and life in Thee is life indeed, to Thee we pray with humble hearts. For Thy name's sake consider and hear us. Awaken deeply in us the divinity that we may have uninterrupted communion with Thee. Take from us unrighteous thoughts, ignoble desires, and selfish ambitions that we may live each day with our associates in the spirit of brotherhood. Help us to so labor for our fellows that they may have life in its fullness of liberty, pursuit of happiness, in peace and dignity. He who lives right serves wisely, and he whose heart responds to the needs of man is our country's true benefactor. Heavenly Father, always enable us to preserve what is best. Persuade us, blessed Lord, that it lies in a broad charity, in wide tolerance, and in a sincere respect for the opinions of others. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176, United States Code, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

AMENDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday I was pleased by the President's recommendations to amend the

Social Security Act. However, I wish that he had included in his recommendations a provision for the payment of compensation to permanently and totally disabled workers beginning at the date of their disability.

Under the Social Security Act at the present time a disabled worker cannot receive any compensation until he reaches the age of 65. In other words, if a married man 40 or 50 years of age becomes totally disabled, he or his family does not receive any aid whatsoever under the provisions of the present act until he reaches the age of 65, as I stated before.

I have introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act which provides that if any working person who comes under the Social Security Act becomes permanently and totally disabled, he will receive compensation beginning on the date of his disability, and that in no case shall any person coming under this amendment receive less than \$60 per month.

I hope the committee, when taking under consideration the recommendations of the President, will include my bill so as to provide compensation for permanently and totally disabled workers who at the present time cannot receive any compensation until they are 65 years of age. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point my bill (H. R. 42) to amend the Social Security Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the bill to which I have referred is as follows:

A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide for the payment of benefits to permanently and totally disabled individuals

Be it enacted, etc., That the title heading of title II of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—FEDERAL OLD-AGE BENEFITS AND DISABILITY BENEFITS"

Sec. 2. Such title II is amended by adding after section 202 the following new section:

"DISABILITY BENEFITS"

"Sec. 202½. (a) Every individual who becomes permanently and totally disabled shall be entitled to receive, with respect to the period beginning on the date he becomes so disabled and ending on the date of his death, a disability benefit (payable as nearly as practicable in equal monthly installments) equal to the old-age benefit he would have been entitled to receive under section 202 if he had attained the age of 65 on the date he became so disabled, but in no such case shall the monthly rate of payment be less than \$60.

"(b) Whenever the Board finds that any individual has received wages with respect to regular employment after becoming permanently and totally disabled the payments to such individual under this section shall be reduced for each calendar month in any part of which such regular employment occurred by an amount equal to 1 month's payment. Such reduction shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Board by deductions from one or more payments to such individual provided for by this section.

"(c) Benefits payable pursuant to this section shall be in lieu of any old-age benefit that would be payable to the same individual with respect to the same period."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 203 of such title II is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 203. (a) If any individual dies before attaining the age of 65 and before any benefit becomes payable to such individual under section 202½, there shall be paid to his estate an amount equal to 3½ percent of the total wages determined by the Board to have been paid to him with respect to employment after December 31, 1936.

"(b) If the Board finds that the correct amount of the benefits payable to an individual during his life under sections 202 and 202½ was less than 3½ percent of the total wages by which such benefits were measurable, then there shall be paid to his estate a sum equal to the amount, if any, by which such 3½ percent exceeds the amount (whether more or less than the correct amount) paid to him during his life under sections 202 and 202½.

"(c) If the Board finds that the total amount paid to an individual during his life under sections 202 and 202½ was less than the correct amount of the benefits to which he was entitled under such sections and that the correct amount of the benefits to which he was so entitled was 3½ percent or more of the total wages by which such benefits were measurable, then there shall be paid to his estate a sum equal to the amount, if any, by which the correct amount of the benefits payable to him under such sections exceeds the amount which was so paid to him during his life."

(b) Section 206 of such title II is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 206. If the Board finds that the total amount paid to an individual during his life under sections 202 and 202½ was more

than the correct amount of the benefits to which he was entitled under such sections, and was $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent or more of the total wages by which the benefits under such sections were measurable, then upon his death there shall be repaid to the United States by his estate the amount, if any, by which such total amount paid to him during his life exceeds whichever of the following is the greater: (1) Such $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent, or (2) the correct amount to which he was entitled under sections 202 and 202 $\frac{1}{2}$."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I noticed that some of the newspapers in the New England States, especially in the State of Maine, had gone out of their way to attack me on my position on the flood-control proposition.

I do not care to take up the time of the House to answer these statements from the floor, so I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein tables showing the electric-power rates paid by the people of the State of Maine.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I may say we are interested in having these power rates put in the RECORD, but there is hardly a day goes by that the gentleman from Mississippi does not place in the RECORD similar figures for one State or another. The gentleman has put the figures in the RECORD a half dozen times. Why fill up the RECORD by again inserting these rates?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania while he is on his feet that he is the last man on earth who ought to object.

Mr. RICH. I am trying to save the RECORD. The gentleman can put in the RECORD all the tables he wishes to, but he should not place them in the RECORD time after time after time.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is not trying to save the RECORD. If he were, he would not have let the long speech of the Governor of Pennsylvania go in the RECORD yesterday, and he would not have let the long speech of the Governor of Vermont go in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH. It is the duty of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle to keep the RECORD clean. The responsibility is not mine; it is the administration's.

Mr. RANKIN. The material I shall put in the RECORD will be clean, although it will show a very bad situation for the people of Maine who have to pay electric bills. Light and power rates in Maine are exorbitant; they are simply terrible; they are even worse than they were in Pennsylvania during the Republican administration, if such a thing is possible.

By exposing the Pennsylvania rates in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we have been able to force reductions of light and power rates in Pennsylvania more than \$40,000,000 a year, and it may help the situation in Maine for us to throw some light on it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I pointed out a day or two ago that the real motive behind the fight against the administration's flood-control program in New England was to prevent the installation of penstocks in those dams for the development of hydroelectric power. The Power Trust does not want that done; they would rather see those dams built of solid concrete and the birthright of the people of New England in their water power destroyed for a hundred years than to see those penstocks built and generators installed that would give the people of New England a yardstick for the proper measurement of electric lights and power.

To build these dams without installing these penstocks would be a crime against the people of New England. It would be a crime against the people living there now and the ones that are to follow them for generations to come.

Nowhere in New England would the people suffer more as the result of such a policy than in the State of Maine. Maine has no coal, she has no gas, she has no oil, and her timber supply is rapidly disappearing. She must depend for her electric current upon the waters in her navigable streams and their tributaries, or upon fuel transported over long distances.

I am going to insert below the table showing the electric rates paid by the people in every city and town in Maine. In that State there are 152,000 domestic consumers of electricity. They use on an average of a little more than 40 kilowatt-hours a month, and every single one of them is overcharged more than 100 percent. Maine produces more white potatoes, or Irish potatoes, as we call them, than any other State in the Union. Yet her entire potato crop last year would not have paid the overcharges on the electric-light bills of the domestic consumers in that State. No wonder the Power Trust and all its influences are opposing the development of Quoddy project and the installation of penstocks in these flood-control dams.

In order that everyone who reads this RECORD may make his own comparisons, I am inserting below a table showing the residential rates for electricity in Ontario, Canada, just across the line from Maine, and in Tacoma, Wash., in the far West, and in the Tennessee Valley in the South.

Since the average consumption in the State of Maine is less than 50 kilowatt-hours a month, I will not run this table above 100 kilowatt-hours, in order to save space in the RECORD—which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is so anxious to conserve.

Table of comparative monthly rates—Residential service

Rates	MONTHLY CONSUMPTION		
	Kilowatt-hours		
	25	40	100
Ontario.....	\$0.75	\$1.02	\$1.74
Tacoma.....	1.13	1.52	2.12
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	.75	1.20	2.50

Now compare the above rates with the rates charged in the State of Maine, as shown by the following table, and remember that Maine borders on Ontario for hundreds of miles.

TABLE 1.—Maine—Typical net monthly bills, Jan. 1, 1938—Residential service, communities of 250 population or more

Community	Population	Lighting and small appliances		Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration—100 kilowatt-hours
		25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	
Abbot.....	250	\$1.85	\$2.60	\$4.70
Acton.....	250	2.00	2.80	5.00
Addison.....	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Albion.....	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Alfred.....	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Andover.....	250	2.60	3.70	7.30
Anson.....	950	1.50	2.40	3.38
Ashland.....	2,100	3.00	4.60	8.60
Do.....	2,100	1.85	2.60	5.60
Athens.....	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Auburn.....	18,371	1.85	2.60	4.70
Augusta.....	17,198	1.85	2.60	4.70
Avon.....	260	2.50	3.25	5.75
Baileys Island.....	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bangor.....	28,749	2.00	2.75	4.70
Bar Harbor.....	4,400	2.25	3.00	4.95
Bar Mills.....	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bath.....	9,110	1.85	2.60	4.70
Belfast.....	4,993	1.85	2.60	4.70
Belgrade Depot.....	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Belgrade Lakes.....	304	1.85	2.60	4.70
Benton.....	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Berwick.....	1,200	2.00	2.80	5.00
Bethel.....	964	1.85	2.60	4.70
Biddeford.....	17,633	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bingham.....	700	1.85	2.60	4.70
Blaine.....	500	2.50	3.25	5.50
Blue Hill.....	800	2.25	3.00	4.95
Blue Hill Falls.....	400	2.25	3.00	4.95

TABLE 1.—Maine—Typical net monthly bills, Jan. 1, 1938—Residential service, communities of 250 population or more—Con.

Community	Population	Lighting and small appliances		Lighting small appliances, and refrigeration—100 kilowatt-hours
		25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	
Boothbay	250	\$1.85	\$2.60	\$4.70
Boothbay Harbor	2,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bowdoinham	302	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bradford Center	270	2.25	3.00	4.95
Bradley	500	2.25	3.00	4.95
Brewer	6,329	2.00	2.75	4.70
Bridgton	1,625	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bristol Mills	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Brooklin	700	2.25	3.00	4.95
Brooks	450	1.85	2.60	4.70
Brownfield	705	2.50	3.25	5.63
Brownville	1,500	2.50	3.40	4.90
Brunswick	6,144	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bryant Pond	500	2.50	3.43	6.70
Buckfield	343	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bucksport	1,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Burnham	350	1.85	2.60	4.70
Calais	5,470	1.85	2.45	4.35
Cambridge	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Camden	2,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Canaan	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Canton	450	1.09	2.38	4.54
Cape Elizabeth	2,365	1.85	2.60	4.70
Capital Island	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Caribou	4,000	2.25	3.00	5.40
Carmel	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Castine	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Cathance	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Center Lovell	270	1.85	2.60	4.70
Cherryfield	1,000	2.25	3.00	4.95
Chesterfield	450	3.00	4.10	6.70
China	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Chisholm	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Christmas Cove	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Clinton	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Coopers Mills	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Corinna	750	1.85	2.60	4.70
Cornish	500	2.15	3.20	5.60
Cornville	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Crescent Beach	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Crouseville	252	2.75	3.50	5.75
Cumberland Center	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Cumberland Foreside	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Damariscotta	700	1.85	2.60	4.70
Damariscotta Mills	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Dark Harbor	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Deer Isle	386	3.50	4.55	7.75
Denmark	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Derby	300	1.50	2.40	6.00
Detroit	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Dexter	3,300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Dixfield	970	1.09	2.38	4.54
Dover Foxcroft	2,600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Dresden Mills	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Dryden	1,100	2.50	3.25	5.20
Eagle Lake	1,200	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do	1,200	1.85	2.60	5.60
East Auburn	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Boothbay	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Hiram	330	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Machias	700	2.25	3.00	4.95
East Millinocket	1,500	2.25	3.00	4.95
East Newport	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Pittston	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Sebago	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Sullivan	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
East Union	300	2.50	3.70	5.00
East Vassalboro	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Wilton	250	2.50	3.25	5.20
Easton	450	2.48	3.96	8.50
Do	450	1.85	2.60	5.60
Eastport	3,466	2.25	3.00	4.95
Ellsworth	3,557	2.25	3.00	4.95
Etna	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Fairbanks	320	2.50	3.25	5.20
Fairfield	3,529	1.85	2.60	4.70
Falmouth	272	1.85	2.60	4.70
Falmouth Foreside	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Farmingdale	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Farmington	1,737	2.50	3.25	5.20
Farmington Falls	445	3.00	4.10	6.70
Fayette	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Fort Fairfield	2,616	2.25	3.00	5.40
Fort Kent	2,245	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do	2,245	1.85	2.60	5.60
Franklin	500	2.25	3.00	4.95
Freedom	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Freeport	973	1.85	2.60	4.70
Frenchville	1,500	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do	1,500	1.85	2.60	5.60
Friendship	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Fryeburg	789	1.85	2.60	4.70
Gardiner	5,609	1.85	2.60	4.70
Getchells Corner	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Gorham	1,083	1.85	2.60	4.70
Gouldsboro	280	2.25	3.00	4.95
Gray	350	1.85	2.60	4.70

TABLE 1.—Maine—Typical net monthly bills, Jan. 1, 1938—Residential service, communities of 250 population or more—Con.

Community	Population	Lighting and small appliances		Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration—100 kilowatt-hours
		25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	
Great Chebeague	320	\$3.45	\$4.40	\$9.20
Greene Depot	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Greenville	1,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Greenville Junction	345	1.85	2.60	4.70
Guilford	1,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hallowell	2,675	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hampden	300	2.00	2.75	4.70
Do	300	3.00	4.20	6.60
Hampden Highlands	500	2.00	2.75	4.70
Harmony	325	1.85	2.60	4.70
Harrington	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Harrison	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hartland	700	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hermon Center	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hinckley	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hiram	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hope	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Houlton	6,000	1.88	2.48	4.28
Howland	950	2.25	3.00	4.95
Island Falls	800	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do	800	1.85	2.60	5.60
Jackman	900	3.00	4.80	6.75
Jay	350	1.85	2.60	4.70
Jefferson	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Jonesboro	268	2.25	3.00	4.95
Jonesport	700	2.25	3.00	4.95
Keegan	730	1.90	2.98	5.50
Kennebunk	2,200	1.63	2.35	4.05
Kennebunk Beach	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Kennebunkport	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Kents Hill	350	1.85	2.60	4.70
Kezar Falls	883	2.15	3.20	5.60
Kingfield	972	2.50	3.25	5.20
Kittery	3,300	2.20	2.80	5.20
Kittery Point	1,500	2.20	2.80	5.20
Lakewood	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lebanon	629	2.00	2.80	5.00
Levant	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lewiston	34,945	1.85	2.60	4.70
Liberty	260	1.85	2.60	4.70
Limerick Mills	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Limestone	500	2.50	3.25	5.65
Lincoln	2,161	2.25	3.00	4.95
Lincoln Center	320	2.25	3.00	4.95
Lincolnton Center	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lisbon	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lisbon Falls	2,666	1.85	2.60	4.70
Livermore Falls	2,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lovell Village	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lower Gloucester	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lubec	1,500	1.55	2.00	3.80
Machias	1,800	2.25	3.00	4.95
Machiasport	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Madawaska	1,705	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do	1,705	1.85	2.60	5.60
Madison	3,036	1.50	2.40	3.38
Manchester	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Manset	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Mars Hill	1,000	2.50	3.25	5.50
Mattawamkeag	400	2.25	3.00	4.95
Mechanic Falls	1,650	1.85	2.60	4.70
Mercer	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Mexico (Ridgelyville)	4,000	1.69	2.38	4.54
Millbridge	1,000	2.25	3.00	4.95
Millford	900	2.00	2.75	4.70
Millinocket	5,350	2.25	3.00	4.95
Milo	1,600	2.50	3.40	4.90
Minot Corner	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Monmouth	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Monroe	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Monson	1,070	1.85	2.60	4.70
Monticello	1,000	2.38	3.13	5.38
Moose River	250	3.00	4.80	6.75
Mount Vernon	300	3.00	4.10	6.70
Naples	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
New Harbor	305	1.85	2.60	4.70
New Vineyard	425	2.50	3.25	5.20
Nawburg	400	3.00	4.20	6.60
Newcastle	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Newfield	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Newport	1,200	1.85	2.60	4.70
Nobleboro	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Norridgewock	800	1.85	2.60	4.70
Do	800	1.50	2.40	3.38
North Anson	1,121	2.50	3.50	5.75
North Berwick	1,200	2.00	2.80	5.00
North Bridgton	410	1.85	2.60	4.70
North Chesterville	270	3.00	4.10	6.70
North Deer Isle	300	3.50	4.55	7.75
North East Harbor	625	2.25	3.00	4.95
North Haven	400	2.50	3.25	5.55
North Jay	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
North Lubec	350	1.55	2.00	3.80
North Monmouth	495	1.85	2.60	4.70
North New Portland	570	3.00	4.50	7.00
North Vassalboro	575	1.85	2.60	4.70
North Whitefield	250	1.85	2.60	4.70

TABLE 1.—Maine—Typical net monthly bills, Jan. 1, 1938—Residential service, communities of 250 population or more.—Con.

Community	Population	Lighting and small appliances		Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration—100 kilowatt-hours
		25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	
North Windham	300	\$1.85	\$2.60	\$4.70
Northport	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Norway	2,446	1.85	2.60	4.70
Oakfield	600	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do.	600	1.85	2.60	5.60
Oakland	2,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Ocean Point	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Ogunquit	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Old Orchard Beach	1,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Old Town	7,266	2.00	2.75	4.70
Oquossoc	634	3.50	4.55	6.75
Orono	2,100	2.00	2.75	4.70
Orrs Island	450	1.85	2.60	4.70
Oxford	483	1.85	2.60	4.70
Palermo	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Palmyra	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Paris Hill	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Patten	800	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do.	800	1.85	2.60	5.60
Peaks Island	712	3.45	4.40	6.20
Pejepscot	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Pemaquid Beach	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Pemaquid Point	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Pembroke	350	2.25	3.00	4.95
Perry	500	2.25	3.00	4.95
Peru	330	1.69	2.38	4.54
Phillips	734	2.50	3.25	5.75
Phippsburg	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Pittsfield	2,075	1.85	2.60	4.70
Plymouth	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Port Clyde	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Portage	516	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do.	516	1.85	2.60	5.60
Portland	70,810	1.85	2.60	4.70
Presque Isle	4,662	2.25	3.00	4.95
Do.	4,662	1.70	2.45	4.45
Princeton	500	3.25	4.90	8.90
Randolph	800	1.85	2.60	4.70
Rangeley	866	3.50	4.55	6.75
Raymond	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Readfield	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Readfield Depot	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Richmond	800	1.85	2.60	4.70
Robbinston	300	2.34	3.09	5.34
Rockland	9,075	1.85	2.60	4.70
Rockport	1,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Round Pond	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Rumford (Rumford Falls)	8,726	1.69	2.38	4.54
Sabattus	900	1.85	2.60	4.70
Saco	7,233	1.85	2.60	4.70
St. Agatha	1,000	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do.	1,000	1.85	2.60	5.60
St. Albans	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
St. Francis	1,000	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do.	1,000	1.85	2.60	5.60
Sanford	9,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Sancerville	700	1.85	2.60	4.70
Seal Cove	600	2.25	3.00	4.95
Seal Harbor	319	2.25	3.00	4.95
Searsmont	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Searsport	1,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Sedgwick	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Shacomut	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Skowhegan	5,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Smithfield	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Solon	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Berwick	1,800	2.00	2.80	5.00
South Brooksville	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
South Casco	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
South China	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Eliot	963	2.20	2.80	5.20
South Freeport	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Gardiner	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Harpswell	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Hope	300	2.50	3.70	5.00
South Paris	1,961	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Portland	13,840	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Thomaston	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Union	250	2.50	3.70	5.00
South Waterford	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Windham	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Southwest Harbor	500	2.25	3.00	4.95
Springvale	2,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Starks	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Steep Falls	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Steuben	400	2.25	3.00	4.95
Stockholm	900	2.50	4.00	8.50
Do.	900	1.85	2.60	5.60
Stockton Springs	390	1.85	2.60	4.70
Stonington	800	3.50	4.55	7.75
Stratton	452	3.75	6.00	15.00
Strong	325	2.50	3.25	5.20
Surry	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Tenants Harbor	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Thomaston	1,700	1.85	2.60	4.70
Thordike	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Togus	2,350	1.85	2.60	4.70

TABLE 1.—Maine—Typical net monthly bills, Jan. 1, 1938—Residential service, communities of 250 population or more.—Con.

Community	Population	Lighting and small appliances		Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration—100 kilowatt-hours
		25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	
Topsham	800	\$1.85	\$2.60	\$4.70
Troy	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Turner Center	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Union	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Unity	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Van Buren	3,300	1.90	2.98	5.50
Vanceboro	300	4.75	7.30	17.50
Vinalhaven	1,800	2.50	3.25	5.55
Waldoboro	1,200	1.85	2.60	4.70
Warren	1,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Washburn	700	2.75	3.50	5.75
Waterford	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Waterville	15,454	1.85	2.60	4.70
Wayne	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Weeks Mills	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Weld	493	2.50	3.25	5.20
Wells	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Wells Beach	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
West Boothbay Harbor	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
West Brooksville	260	2.25	3.00	4.95
West Enfield	700	2.25	3.00	4.95
West Farmington	395	2.50	3.25	5.20
West Franklin	250	2.25	3.00	4.95
West Gardiner	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
West Hampden	300	3.00	4.20	6.60
West Jonesport	500	2.25	3.00	4.95
West Kennebunk	719	1.63	2.35	4.05
West Lubec	300	1.55	2.00	3.80
West Paris	513	1.85	2.60	4.70
West Pembroke	350	2.25	3.00	4.95
West Scarborough	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
West Sullivan	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Westbrook	10,807	1.85	2.60	4.70
Whitefield	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Whiting	275	1.55	2.00	3.80
Wilton	2,000	2.50	3.25	5.20
Winn	250	2.25	3.00	4.95
Winslow	3,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Winslow Mills	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Winter Harbor	400	2.25	3.00	4.95
Winterport	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Winthrop	1,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Wiscasset	750	1.85	2.60	4.70
Woodland	1,800	2.40	3.60	6.00
Woolwich	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Yarmouth	1,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Yarmouth Junction	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
York Beach	425	1.85	2.60	4.70
York Village	500	1.85	2.60	4.70

Who can read these high rates imposed upon the helpless consumers in the State of Maine and compare them with the rates paid just across the line in Ontario without being shocked at such a merciless exaction of exorbitant overcharges?

What we are trying to do is to secure justice for the people in that State, as well as in all other States, by bringing light and power rates down to their normal levels. The installation of these penstocks, against which selfish interests so vigorously protest, will be the greatest step yet taken in that direction.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—TAX IMMUNITIES (H. DOC. NO. 113)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my message of April 25, 1938, I urged that the time had come when the Congress should exercise its constitutional power to tax income from whatever source derived. I urged that the time had come when private income should not be exempt either from Federal or State income tax simply because such private income is derived as interest from Federal, State, or municipal obligations, or because it is received as compensation for services rendered to the Federal, State, or municipal Governments.

A fair and effective progressive income tax and a huge perpetual reserve of tax-exempt bonds could not exist side by side. Those who earn their livelihood from Government should bear the same tax burden as those who earn their livelihood in private employment.

The tax immunities heretofore accorded to private income derived from Government securities or Government employment are not inexorable requirements of the Constitution but are the result of judicial decision. I repeat that it is not unreasonable to hope that judicial decision would permit the elimination of these immunities.

Decisions of the Supreme Court rendered since my message, particularly the decision in the Port of New York Authority case, have made an important and constructive contribution to the elimination of these inequitable immunities.

It is obvious, however, that these inequities cannot be satisfactorily corrected by judicial decisions alone. Without legislation to supplement them, many individuals and corporations will be subjected to tax liabilities for income received in past years which they mistakenly but in good faith believed to be tax-exempt. It is evident, for example, that employees of many State agencies as well as the holders of securities of public corporations believed that the income they received from such sources was tax-exempt in view of the opinions of eminent counsel based upon earlier decisions of the Supreme Court. In the interest of equity and justice, therefore, immediate legislation is required to prevent recent judicial decisions from operating in such a retroactive fashion as to impose tax liability on those innocent employees and investors for salaries heretofore earned or on income derived from securities heretofore issued.

In the light of those decisions there are, among the taxpayers of the Nation, inevitable uncertainties respecting their tax liabilities. There is uncertainty whether the salaries which they receive are not taxable under the existing provisions of the revenue acts; there is uncertainty whether the interest which they receive upon the obligations of governmental instrumentalities is similarly not taxable; and there is an uncertainty whether the salaries and interest which they have received for past years will create an unanticipated source of tax liabilities and penalties.

In view of the fact that the Bureau of Internal Revenue will have no choice but to enforce our income-tax law as declared in the latest decisions of the Supreme Court, prompt legislation is necessary to safeguard against the inequities to which I have referred. The need, therefore, is for the prompt enactment of equitable rules, prospective in operation, which the Bureau can apply and taxpayers can observe without that mass of litigation which otherwise is to be anticipated. We are confronted with a situation which can be handled with fairness to all and with reasonable administrative convenience only through the cooperation of the Congress and the courts.

Unless the Congress passes some legislation dealing with this situation prior to March 15, I am informed by the Secretary of the Treasury that he will be obliged to collect back taxes for at least 3 years upon the employees of many State agencies and upon the security holders of many State corporate instrumentalities, who mistakenly but in good faith believed they were tax-exempt. The assessment and collection of these taxes will doubtlessly in many cases produce great hardship.

Accordingly, I recommend legislation to correct the existing inequitable situation, and at the same time to make private income from all Government salaries hereafter earned and from all Government securities hereafter issued subject to the general income-tax laws of the Nation and of the several States. It is difficult for almost all citizens to understand why a constitutional provision permitting taxes on "income from whatever source derived" does not mean "from whatever source derived."

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1939.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—TEMPORARY DETAIL OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES TO GOVERNMENTS OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS AND THE PHILIPPINES (H. DOC. NO. 114)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation designed to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of United States employees, possessing special qualifications, to Governments of American Republics and the Philippines, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1938, in order to obviate difficulties encountered in administering the fiscal provisions of the act.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1939.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2½ minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I may say we are going to begin general debate in just a few moments.

Mr. REED of New York. I shall not press the point if it is not convenient. I can wait until some other time.

Mr. RAYBURN. We should like to get along with the general debate. I may say to the gentleman from New York, he knows I would hate very much to object to any request he might make, but I tried during the last session of Congress to hold down to 1 minute remarks made before the consideration of the legislative program of the day was begun.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I want the time just now is that I have some information which I believe the Members of the House may wish to study with reference to the President's message. I was just going to call the attention of the Members to another message which has some application to what was stated in the message today. However, I shall defer to the wishes of the majority leader.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Westbrook Pegler appearing on last Friday, entitled "Deep Thinking."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1939

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2868) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 5), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2868) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue throughout the day, the time

to be equally divided between myself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2868, and pending that motion asks unanimous consent that general debate on the bill continue throughout the day, the time to be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from New York. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the debate to be confined to the bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2868, the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939, with Mr. DOXEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The bill is as follows:

H. R. 2868 (Rept. No. 5)

A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, namely:

LEGISLATIVE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to the widow of Allard H. Gasque, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, \$10,000.

For payment to the widow of Robert L. Bacon, late a Representative from the State of New York, \$10,000.

For payment to the widow of John J. Boylan, late a Representative from the State of New York, \$10,000.

For payment to the widow of Stephen W. Gambrill, late a Representative from the State of Maryland, \$10,000.

For payment to the widow of Ben Cravens, late a Representative from the State of Arkansas, \$10,000.

The five foregoing sums to be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

National forest protection and management: For an additional amount for national forest protection and management, including the same purposes and objects specified under this head in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1939, \$500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1940, and to be expended only for the protection and management of the White Mountain National Forest, New Hampshire and Maine, including the salvaging of wind-damaged timber and restoration of experimental areas therein.

New England hurricane damage: For rehabilitation and reestablishment of forest-protection improvements, reduction of forest-fire hazards, and prevention of forest fires on State, county, municipal, and private forest lands in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut that were damaged by the hurricane of September 1938, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, and the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, fiscal year 1939, to remain available until June 30, 1940, \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply in the case of any expenditure hereunder where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$300: *Provided further*, That the amount allocated for expenditure in any State of the amount herein appropriated shall be available when the State to which allocation has been made shall have made or shall make available a like sum from State funds for the purposes contained herein.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases: For carrying out the purposes and provisions of, and for expenditures authorized under, Public Resolution No. 91, Seventy-fifth Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled Joint resolution making funds available for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases, including grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and chinch bugs," approved April 6, 1937," approved May 9, 1938 (52

Stat. 344, 1126), fiscal year 1939, to remain available until December 31, 1939, \$2,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act, Department of Labor—Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for all authorized and necessary expenses of the Wage and Hour Division in performing the duties imposed upon it by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, contract stenographic reporting services, travel expenses, including not to exceed \$2,500 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Wage and Hour Division when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, printing and binding, law books, books of reference, periodicals, manuscripts and special reports, newspapers and press clippings, supplies, office equipment, advertising, postage, telephone and telegraph service, reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, fiscal year 1939, \$850,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor may allot or transfer, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, funds from this appropriation to any bureau or office of the Department of Labor to enable such agency to perform services for the Wage and Hour Division.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses, child-labor provisions, Fair Labor Standards Act, Children's Bureau: For an additional amount for all authorized and necessary expenses of the Children's Bureau in performing the duties imposed upon it by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses; printing and binding; supplies; equipment, newspapers, books of reference, periodicals, and press clippings; and reimbursement to State and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, as authorized by section 11 of said act, fiscal year 1939, \$79,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Children's Bureau under the Fair Labor Standards Act when called by the Children's Bureau with the written approval of the Secretary of Labor, and shall be available also in an amount not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Children's Bureau under said act when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

PROCUREMENT DIVISION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS BRANCH

Bureau of the Census Building, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.: For the acquisition of the necessary land and the construction of a building for the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), as amended, including the extension of steam and water mains, removal or diversion of such sewers and utilities as may be necessary, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$3,500,000.

Sec. 2. This act may be cited as the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the deficiency bill now pending before the Committee contains six items which the Bureau of the Budget felt were very urgent and, perhaps, should not be held over until we would ordinarily bring in a deficiency bill about the middle of February. I may say that the bill and report are available if Members wish to see them.

On page 2 of the bill there are items for the payment of the usual amounts to the widows of deceased Members.

The next two items in the bill are for the United States Forest Service in consequence of the hurricane and flood which visited New England in September 1938. It will be recalled that this hurricane was of unusual ferocity and with devastating effect it swept over the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, laying waste vast areas of their fine timberlands in addition to the terrific damage that was done by flood waters.

The first item on page 2 of this bill is for \$500,000 for the National Forest Service, to augment the amount of about \$11,500,000 which they have in the current appropriation bill for such purposes, and this amount of \$500,000 is to be used in the White Mountain National Forest area for the purpose of cleaning up fallen timber, eliminating fire hazards, and reestablishing fire-prevention stations and facilities. The Bureau of the Budget estimated \$700,000 for this item. The committee cut the amount to \$500,000, feeling that this amount of money, in addition to such portion of the usual

amount of \$11,500,000 which the Forest Service has for national forest protection and management, augmented further by the activities of 45 Civilian Conservation Corps camps which are operating in the storm-damaged area, and augmented further by the services of some 15,000 to 17,000 W. P. A. workers who, our New England brethren told us, in this particular instance, have performed very notable and valuable service, would be a sufficient sum to enable the Forest Service to do the fire-prevention work and other necessary tasks on the Government-owned lands, and we have brought in a report accordingly.

The next item of \$3,000,000 is practically for the same purposes but is to be used upon the privately owned lands in those States where the hurricane wrought such havoc and damage.

It was represented to our committee that something like 4,000,000,000 feet of merchantable timber was laid upon the ground by the force of this terrible storm. This is as much timber as would normally be cut and marketed in 5 years, which, at one swoop of a magic wand, as it were, was laid upon the ground, and we were told that it constitutes a fire menace and danger of major proportions. The committee could well comprehend that such a situation would be a menace to that part of the country and that it probably was of such national character as to justify the Federal Government in taking cognizance of the necessity to assist in fire-preventive measures. The Bureau of the Budget has sent in an estimate of \$5,000,000 to be used by the Forest Service on these privately owned lands toward cleaning up the devastated timber areas and restoring fire protection and prevention facilities. The committee went into the matter, we feel, very carefully. Our colleagues from New England on both sides of the aisle were kind enough to come before the committee and give us the benefit of their information and judgment and, of course, were very much interested, naturally, in seeing that appropriate and adequate relief from this condition was afforded to the territories they represented.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would rather finish a chronological statement, and then I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

We found, however, that notwithstanding the fire hazard and the menace of this condition that had existed since September 1938, little or nothing had been done by the States involved toward meeting the cost of relieving the situation. It developed that the State of Massachusetts—and I shall be pleased to be corrected if I am in error—had by legislative enactment made available something like \$19,000,000 for repairs in the flood- and hurricane-stricken area.

But a very small part, an infinitesimally small part, of that sum had been designated to be used in this method of cleaning up the fire hazards caused by this fallen timber.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am told that over a million dollars was appropriated to be used on the State forest reservations, and, as the gentleman knows, we suffered terribly from the flood. Roads were damaged, our bridges were down, and there was a very bad condition of sanitation. That money had to go for that use as a matter of health protection and transportation. Will the gentleman yield further about matching dollar for dollar at this point?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that under our State constitution Massachusetts cannot match an appropriation dollar for dollar for work in private property and lands, and a great deal of this timber is a part of the farmhouses. The timber was cut in order to build the farmhouse and for the other accessory buildings. So I am not sure that we can avail ourselves of any of the money that must be matched dollar for dollar. I am sending for the ruling by the Attorney General on that point. The Supreme Court ruled on a rather similar occasion that the State could not contribute

toward clearing or helping in respect to private lands. It is a very serious proposition for us.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it is a serious proposition for all of us.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is, because it affects the whole country. If the purchasing power of all New England is greatly diminished by great fires, certainly the entire country will be the loser.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. I understood the gentleman to say that the State contributions have been infinitesimal, and then he referred to what Massachusetts has bonded itself for at the special session of the legislature, and I shall talk about that more a little later, if I am permitted to do so. I have in my hand here a photostatic copy of the law passed at the extra session of the Massachusetts Legislature, and included in that \$19,000,000 were the following: Title 201-A, Forestry, \$850,000; 281-B, Forest fire service, \$123,000; 281-C, Recreations, \$90,000; 288-A, Parks, \$67,000; Enforcement of laws, \$2,678; aggregating considerably over \$1,000,000. That was direct for fire protection under this special appropriation of \$19,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. I would say that the New Hampshire Legislature has not been in session since this disaster, but the Governor has just made a recommendation to the legislature, that has just gone into session, that a substantial sum of money be appropriated to take care of its part of this disaster.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I felt confident that that would be done.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The only obstacle I see now is getting the consent of the Governor of Vermont. Before you can do anything in Vermont, you have to get unanimous consent nowadays.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It does appear, however, that the only financial aid rendered by any State involved in this tragedy is the \$1,000,000 of the \$19,000,000 appropriated by the State of Massachusetts. So far as the committee knows, no other State involved has made available any funds for this purpose.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again there?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I interrupt again at this point to state that, as the gentleman knows, the President sent on a great many people from the forestry and the W. P. A. and various Government agencies, and there was a general feeling that a great deal of money would be given to the States for rehabilitation work. That may be one reason why the other States did not contribute—through a misunderstanding.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Whatever the reason may be, the fact remains that they have not taken cognizance of the fact that what they recommend to the Congress is a serious menace—and I do not underestimate that it is a menace—they have taken no action themselves to ameliorate it. I do not see why the Federal Government should bear the major portion of the cost of cleaning the situation up.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There has never been such a hurricane, such disaster, and such danger to timberlands before.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, let me say to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts that there have been many national tragedies, even in my experience here of 16 years, and almost without exception the action that Con-

gress has taken has been to make available loans to the areas affected. Those loans in many cases were almost without security, but at least they went through the form of loans, for the very reason that the Congress as a national legislature is affected by the same ethical and theoretical conditions that the gentlewoman finds affect her own State. We have no right theoretically to appropriate money to be used on private lands.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But the fire hazard is so extremely great in Massachusetts alone, where 531 lives to the square mile are endangered by this fire hazard. It is an emergency; this is not a regular appropriation and must be made immediately if it is to serve its purpose. The threat of fire is even more serious than the hurricane.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I quite agree with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, and the committee agrees. Otherwise we would not be recommending \$3,000,000 of Federal Government money to meet this situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the people live 531 to the square mile, as the lady from Massachusetts says, they ought to be able to put out any fire.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Are we laying down a policy that will come back to plague us in the future, that whenever we have some disaster, due to an act of God, the Congress of the United States will be called upon to rehabilitate the area?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman, as he well knows, the Congress has responded on many occasions to relieve suffering in the drought areas in Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida and other States, but they were loans in most cases by or through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and many of them have been repaid.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is this a loan or an outright gift?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This is an outright gift.

Mr. COCHRAN. Well, there is a difference between the two even though you require the States in this instance to match the Government contribution.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course there is a difference, but the evidence before our committee was to the effect that it had been such a terrific blow to this section of the country, not only this section but to the individuals involved, that we felt the Federal Government, through the Forest Service, might have a substantial part in cleaning it up.

Mr. COCHRAN. Another question. Does not the gentleman feel there should be some limitation placed upon the amount you are going to spend in the District of Columbia?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It does not provide for any of it to be spent in the District of Columbia.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, yes; in the bill you provide that part of it can be spent in the District of Columbia even for printing and binding and also for automobiles. Now, the District of Columbia was not affected by the hurricane. You are liable to have a lot of employees in the District of Columbia getting a lot of this money that should go to this area. The Forest Service should be able to handle this without additional personnel.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

I should be willing for the gentleman from Missouri to draw an amendment. I am sure the committee has no objection to a reasonable limitation. Of necessity, there will be some departmental expense in administering this money, but I would have no objection to any reasonable limitation that the gentleman feels should go in here.

Mr. COCHRAN. This has come so fast that I have no information about the project at all. The bill has just come in and the hearings released only an hour ago. Those who heard the testimony should be able to draw an amendment which provides for a limitation, or better still, one that would prevent any of the money being used in the District

of Columbia. Let them get along with their present force here.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understood that the Congress gave an outright grant to the city of Chicago at the time of the great fire, and to California at the time of the earthquake and fire in San Francisco. So there is a precedent for this. This country has given grants to foreign countries in supplies to care for distressed people.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That may be true.

Now, the next item in the bill is an item for the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, for the control of various insects—Mormon crickets, chinch bugs, various kinds of grasshoppers and other pests that come along to pester people and crops.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The Bureau of Entomology, as I understand, recommended to the Budget \$6,000,000 to take care of these pests. The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$3,300,000. Is that correct?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have not had a chance to read the record. Has the gentleman ever seen these grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and so forth, in action? They are about as long as the old crawfish we used to see in the swamps. Has the gentleman ever seen these things in action?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; but I have heard they are quite active.

Mr. O'CONNOR. They are very active. They will go into a field of wheat in the morning, and usually it is destroyed by nighttime. Of course, I do not know who the other members of the committee are, but I am taking your word for it that you never saw these bugs in action. Does not the gentleman think that the department that has to do with the carrying on of this work, together with the aid of the farmers who actually do the work in the spreading of this bait, and so forth, ought to know more about what would be necessary to conduct this campaign against these pests than we Members sitting down here who really do not know much about it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Ordinarily, it would seem that they would, but actually they do not. I say that for this reason: They have come before our committee on more than one occasion with an estimate for pest control in excess of what the committee felt was justified. The committee cut their estimates, and our friends hollered blue murder. They had just been ruined. They envisioned the grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, chinch bugs, and other bugs just carrying the country away. They were just ruined. Yet they were not able to spend the appropriations we provided.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I know the gentleman is going to say they did not get the money as soon as they should. That is true.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will call the gentleman's attention to another thing. I get this from the Bureau of Entomology in Washington. They tell me that in Montana those bugs, grasshoppers, and crickets were eradicated early in the spring and then they migrated, later on, from the State of North Dakota into Montana, and I have these figures from the Bureau of Entomology. As the result of their invading the State of Montana later on in the spring, crops to the value of \$6,000,000 were destroyed by them.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Here is the point to the thing: There is no doubt this Department will not spend any money that is not necessary to carry on this campaign. Let us give them sufficient at this time to prevent just such occurrences as have been outlined to the gentleman by the Bureau here in Washington.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They did a very good job last year in controlling it. No effort, apparently, is being

made to exterminate these insect pests. The Bureau of Entomology and the Department of Agriculture have thrown up their hands, seemingly. They do not know what to do. About all they can do is to fight them when they put in an appearance. Last year they did a very good job with \$2,000,000 and did not get it nearly as soon as we are making it available to them this year. We are giving them the same amount they got last year and giving it to them very much earlier. They will have available \$2,700,000, which ought to be ample.

The next item is for the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act. That act was passed very late in the last session of Congress. An amount of \$400,000 was made available. The Administrator has set up the organization. They are operating, they are trying to meet the terrific duty imposed upon the Department of Labor in the construction and control of this new law affecting every State in the Union and every business and every industry to some extent.

We went into the matter very carefully. The Budget estimate of \$950,000 the committee cut to \$850,000, not with the idea of trying to throw any impediment in the way of a fair enforcement of this act and a fair trial for it but upon the statement of the Administrator that all of the personnel had to come from civil service. Many examinations have to be held to recruit his staff, and we felt that the slight cut made by the committee would be evidence of the committee's hope and of the hope of the Congress that he would move cautiously.

We were very much encouraged to hear from Mr. Andrews the statement that in traveling over the country and contacting many business and industrial leaders who had been very antagonistic to the suggestion of the passage of such a law and who had opposed it in every way they could, that they now show almost universally a fine spirit of co-operation and intention to try it out, put it into operation in their plants, and endeavor to make it work. Almost invariably, however, they impressed upon the Administrator the fact that if the law is ever to be a success, in order to be fair to those who are trying to observe it, the administration should enforce it against those who are inclined to disobey it. The committee did not feel that the Congress should be too drastic in curtailing a new agency of such wide scope and character as the wage and hour division, and I do not believe we have.

The last item in the bill is for the purpose of erecting a Census Bureau building. When the matter was first suggested to me, that we were being called upon to build another Government building in Washington, I was antagonistic to the idea. We went into the matter very carefully and we found that in the District of Columbia, Government agencies are now housed in 120 buildings other than Government-owned buildings. Twenty-two thousand employees of the Government are employed in these privately owned buildings. The rental bill that we are paying to the landlords of Washington is \$3,500,000. The Department of Agriculture is housed in 29 different buildings and pays \$468,000 a year rent. The Department of the Interior, although we just built a handsome new building for it, is housed in 11 different buildings and is paying \$236,000 a year rent. The Treasury Department is in 16 different buildings. Government agencies, as I say, are in 120 different privately owned buildings in Washington and are paying \$3,500,000 rent.

We are faced with the fact that we must take the decennial census. In order to take the census the Bureau of the Census will have to augment its normal personnel of about 700 to a personnel of about 7,500 in the District of Columbia for 6 or 8 months.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

There will be housed in this building in the District of Columbia the 7,500 people who will take this census. They all come from civil-service rolls. They are temporary employees. There is no space in the District of Columbia that can be gotten to house this activity. The only other alterna-

tive would be to have some private individual or agency put up a building. Bids were solicited from such sources, and the best offer received was for a building way out on the outskirts of Washington where transportation would be difficult, and at a rental of something like \$400,000 a year.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Would this building that it is proposed to build house 7,500 for 6 months in the 10-year period and then only 700 during the other nine and a half years?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am coming to that, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I notice an item for New Hampshire and Maine. I was of the opinion that New Hampshire and Maine did not want any relief from the Federal Government.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We had a pretty full discussion of that matter, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARTON. Does the gentleman think it would be in order to abolish some of these bureaus, such as the National Emergency Council and the Guffey Coal Commission, to make room for the Census Bureau?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it is very much in order to abolish some of the commissions, I may say to the gentleman; but when you look over the list of agencies that are housed in rented buildings, the gentleman will find he raises a very difficult problem.

Mr. Chairman, this is not any peculiar condition that has existed for only the last 6 years. Since I have been here, a total of 16 years, the Government has had a terrific rent bill. The Government has always paid for outside space and has never had sufficient room in the public buildings in Washington, even when my friend's party was in power. There were more bureaus and agencies in Washington at that time than the Federal Government had buildings in which to house them.

Mr. BARTON. Does the gentleman know how many buildings have been built under this administration to house these new bureaus?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. A great many buildings, but the majority of the fine building program in the District of Columbia can be taken credit for by my friend's party. The first great building that was put up was the palace for the Department of Commerce, with the noted gold-plate dishes for the Secretary of Commerce, as my friend will remember, the shower bath, the private elevator, and what not.

That was the first palace that Mr. Hoover built. All of the string of buildings along Constitution Avenue was started under the administration of the gentleman's party, and the gentleman's party can take credit for them because this is the greatest nation in the world and we should have a government housed commensurate with its dignity. I favor that, and I am sure the gentleman does.

Mr. BARTON. When Mr. Hoover was putting up that building, does the gentleman recall what the national deficit was as compared with the present time?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, there was a deficit, and there has been a deficit right along. The gentleman and I understand that.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, when those buildings were authorized, the national debt was being reduced at a great rate. This Congress passed bills reducing the debt at the rate of a billion dollars a year. There was no deficit. These buildings were authorized in the prosperous

days, but many of them have been built in the depression days.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is a long story. History will tell the story in full.

Mr. MICENER. But is that not so?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not want to get into that. The question now is, Shall we build the Census Building that is needed? This type of building is badly needed by the departments in Washington. Answering specifically my friend's question, when the census is completed and the normal personnel of the Bureau of the Census drops back to 700 or so, one of two things will happen; either there will be brought in some of these agencies that are housed now in rented quarters or else do what should be done—that is, put into the building a great many of the inactive files of some of these departments that now occupy high-priced rental space in other buildings, files that do not come within the category of records that should be put in the Archives Building and yet should not be destroyed. The building is needed for the regular, normal activities of the Government. Even if our dreams and hopes for restriction of unnecessary agencies should mature, we could not hope to vacate all of these 120 buildings.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I notice the report states that the building will be of the brick and sandstone type. If that building is located near Constitution Avenue, does the gentleman think that would mar the beauty of Constitution Avenue and the buildings located thereon?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is not to be located in that group of monumental buildings on Constitution Avenue. It is to be well back of the Mall and will be of the same type as the building occupied by the Procurement Division, a very substantial one—will involve a construction cost of about \$9 per square foot. It is a utilitarian type of building.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman does not think the location of this type of building here will mar that locality?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; the building will be well removed from the locality the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I shall speak solely of the one item involving disaster from the recent hurricane in New England, and I would like to give a brief description of my own personal experience in that flood and hurricane.

On the morning of September 21 last year I endeavored to drive from my home in western Massachusetts to Springfield, where I had a scheduled meeting, not a political one, purely business. I found that following 3 or 4 days of constant, steady rain the roads were practically impassible. I therefore drove a few miles and took a train from Pittsfield to Springfield, which was one of the last trains to operate over the Boston & Albany Railroad for quite a period of time. Following the meeting I attended in Springfield I had occasion to go to Holyoke, which is the largest city in my district. A friend had driven the 11 miles from Holyoke to Springfield to meet me. At that time it was raining terrifically hard, and my friend drove down through the rain. About 4:30 in the afternoon, following the business meeting I was attending, one of my friends came out of the building where we had held the meeting and said the radio had announced a hurricane was coming up the New England coast. This was the first intimation of the possibility of the hurricane's visiting that area. Another friend came from the same meeting and said, "My wife is driving home from down in Connecticut and I am worried about her on account of the rain." The suddenness of this catastrophe can be shown by the fact that the next morning I picked up a newspaper and read that the wife of this friend had been drowned in an effort to get back to Springfield that afternoon.

LXXXIV—33

What I have said so far has to do with the rain, which continued for quite a few days, but at half past four in the afternoon when I left Springfield for Holyoke the wind started. We were 2 hours covering the 11 miles between those two cities, over a good State highway which in ordinary circumstances one could travel in 20 minutes. I got to the point where fear no longer existed for me because the feeling of helplessness came over one so strongly. Trees were coming down all over the road, wires were being thrown down, and automobiles were being hit. One did not know from 1 minute to another whether the next tree was going to fall on the car one happened to be in or fall down beside the road. Through the skillful driving of my friend I was able to get to Holyoke in about 2 hours. This gives you just a word picture of the terrible suddenness of this storm.

The hurricane followed the flood. We were therefore doubly afflicted, first by the tremendous flood and second by the hurricane.

The first preparation for recovery had to do with the flood. Entire towns were inundated. Roads were absolutely washed out in entire communities. The events of which I have been speaking occurred on a Wednesday afternoon. On the following Saturday I attended a meeting of representatives of the towns of Franklin County, Mass., all of which are in my district. The county commissioners were endeavoring to appease the citizens of these small communities, telling them what they could do for them and what they would do for them. People in large areas there were endeavoring to get milk to the market daily, and were finding fault because they could not get their milk to market. The chairman of the county commissioners said, "Suppose we could send a team up into that town instead of trying to get down there by automobile truck, would that be all right? Could we not send you a team to get the milk down to market?" "Why, Mr. Commissioner," was the reply, "a goat could not travel over a single road in the town."

Where a goat could not go certainly there were not many transportation facilities.

Following this tremendous storm I made a trip to Washington: purposely to see some of the officials. They were extremely courteous and very much interested in the story of the flood conditions. However, that action had to do with the clearing up at that particular time.

Certain towns in my district were absolutely put out of business. No industry survived this awful flood. I could take all the time allotted to me in telling you of that situation, but what you are interested in today is the hurricane situation, so I wish to pass on to the hurricane feature of the existing situation. I say "existing" because the result of it still exists right there.

We found the Forest Service eager to cooperate in every way possible, and they have been continuing to do so. I read in the report which has just been issued by the Committee on Appropriations certain very significant statements, which I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] for making as they certainly aid our case tremendously. For instance, the report states:

The evidence is indisputable as to the urgent need of freeing the wooded areas—some 8,000,000 acres, through which the storm passed—of great quantities of inflammable debris, constituting a serious fire hazard, in many cases adjacent to thickly populated communities.

In another place the report states:

The Congress has, in the case of a number of past catastrophes, responded with Federal financial aid.

I have here a long list, and I am sorry it is not carried up to the present time, of instances of aid the Federal Government has rendered when catastrophes have occurred, even in Italy. There is an item here of Congress appropriating \$800,000 for procurement and distribution of provisions, clothing, medicines, and so forth, for the suffering and destitute people of Italy as a result of the Messina earthquake. Many of the items in the list I hold in my hand refer to loans, so-called, but of course not repaid and not expected to be

repaid. For instance, reference is made to the fire in San Francisco, and to the appropriation of \$100,000,000 as a revolving fund to furnish foodstuffs to the populations of Europe following the war. Here is an item of \$1,775,000 for Army stores for the relief of sufferers from fire at Astoria, Oreg.

As I see it, no greater calamity ever happened than what has happened to New England at the present time, so why should there be any anxiety at the present time over the size of the appropriation to be made by the Congress to relieve this terrible situation?

I particularly call the attention of the Members of the House to this map. It is a map of New England. The pink area here is where the hurricane hit. The hurricane came up from Long Island Sound on the afternoon of which I have spoken, and about half past 4 in the afternoon it started and went directly up through that entire area, hitting sections in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and a small section of Maine.

Every New England State was directly affected, and there is timber down in this whole area.

Now, look at these pictures which I have here from the Forest Service, every one of them showing down timber. While this picture I have here is small and not very easy for the Members of the House to see, yet here is a very typical picture of the down timber surrounding a farmhouse, and unless this slash is cleaned up and removed by spring, even though the logs are taken out of there, is there a chance in the world for the inhabitants of this house to be able to save that property? Fire is inevitable.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will yield to the gentleman, but I must finish my statement on the bill.

Mr. REED of New York. I simply wanted to call attention to the fire hazard involved there.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am coming to that very feature, and that is exactly what I meant when I asked if there was a chance for the inhabitants of this place to survive.

These other pictures I have here are quite similar. This particular picture happens to be on a State forest in New Hampshire. I simply wish the House to see the condition in that area, which is duplicated everywhere. Here are logs, which, of course, are perhaps merchantable and marketable, but when you go in and clean up by just taking out the logs, naturally, you are leaving all this slash and there is a fire hazard of tremendous proportions.

What the Forest Service did was to endeavor to make contracts with the owners of private property to take out their merchantable timber.

Let me give you a word of illustration about that. I attended a meeting just before Congress opened. I was asked to come up to a town in my district to meet the owners of down timber. I went to that meeting and met 60 men and women whose entire source of income or entire property was flat on the ground. They did not have a dollar with which to market this timber or to continue carrying on their work as ordinary farmers. There were 60 of these people and I am going to speak of them, as well as the entire Massachusetts picture, a little later, but I want to cover particularly the New England situation as we who are in New England see it.

I am a Massachusetts man, interested in Massachusetts as such, and interested in these constituents of mine that I am telling you about who are suffering so as a result of this existing situation, and appealing to you in their behalf, but the picture is bigger than any one State, Mr. Chairman, the picture is a New England picture as shown by this map.

Now, the Forest Service estimates there are 14,000,000 acres in the hurricane area; that is 14,000,000 in this pink section of the map, and there are 150,000 acres of down timber on which there are from three and a half to four billion feet. The Forest Service has made 2,000 contracts covering 400,000,000 feet already. The method of contracting is this. The Forest Service has graded this timber into three classes,

1, 2, and 3, of which they estimate that class 1 is about 5 percent. On that they will pay \$18 per thousand feet at a mill or at a pond. The next classification is at \$14 a thousand and this they estimate at about 40 percent. The other 55 percent is in the third classification at \$12. This \$12 means that under the Disaster Loan Corporation there will be paid to those log owners at a pond or at a mill, no matter how inaccessible it may be, or how impossible it may be for the lot owner to get his timber to these places, \$12 per thousand feet in the log, less 10 percent; in other words, it will amount to \$10.80 only.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman very briefly, because I have a long picture to paint.

Mr. HARE. I am just wondering whether the price designated by the gentleman refers to sawed timber or is the price in the log.

Mr. TREADWAY. In the log.

Mr. HARE. A pretty high price.

Mr. TREADWAY. Not a sufficient price to encourage the owners to market the logs or return a new dollar for an old one.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. When they have forest fires in the State of Washington, the Government does not pay the people out there for the damage, and I do not see why they should pay for these damages which they have sustained from forest fires in New England.

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not know about other fires, although I do know that Oregon has been paid in a similar case.

I have here another picture of the same situation I have been describing, and these pictures are available if any Members care to see them in more detail.

After these 2,000 contracts are made, and we hope the number will be materially increased, you will still have this terrible fire hazard; and unless this fire hazard is removed by early spring, just as soon as this slash begins to dry out, no one can conceive of the probable damage that will happen in the way of fires.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. Are not the C. C. C. now engaged in clearing away that brush?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; they are doing as good a job as it is possible to do, and I shall be very glad to quote a reference from the Forest Service that I have of the work that they are doing; but there are not enough of them, nor of the W. P. A.

Mr. HEALEY. Their work is also on private property?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HEALEY. Where there may be a fire hazard.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; and perhaps it might be well, as long as the gentleman is referring to private property, for me to bring up the situation in Massachusetts, as regards the item in the bill before us, namely, the matter of matching dollar for dollar. I have a telegram that I received last evening from the Governor of Massachusetts, which reads as follows:

HON. ALLEN TREADWAY,

House of Representatives:

Over \$1,000,000 appropriated at special session of Massachusetts Legislature, October 1938, to remove fire hazard in timberlands owned by Commonwealth, including farms, reservation areas, and State forests. Appropriation for privately owned timberlands not permitted under State constitution. Fallen timber in this State estimated at one and one-half to two billion board feet, including four million in State-owned properties. Removal cost estimate, \$3,000,000. Approximately 9,000 C. C. C. and W. P. A. workers employed removing hazard from privately owned areas under easements. Doubt that Massachusetts can participate on dollar-matching program on privately owned properties.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Therefore, we cannot match dollar for dollar, as I see it, because we are prohibited under the State constitution from using the State funds on private lands. The telegram of

the Governor explains the situation as far as Massachusetts is concerned in connection with the item in the bill under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to proceed, but I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman any information as to the probability of these devastated lands being reforested by nature?

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, let us get over the catastrophe before we begin to find out what we will do in the future.

Mr. KNUTSON. The reason I asked that question is this. It is a fire hazard at the present time and if that hazard is not cleared up and there should be a severe fire, it would retard reforestation.

Mr. TREADWAY. I agree with the gentleman that perhaps we ought eventually to reforest it, but let us clean it up first so that we can reforest it.

I take occasion at this moment to speak most highly of both the Forester, Mr. Silcox, and his assistant, Mr. Tinker, and the cooperation they have endeavored to give us in Massachusetts, but there are not ample funds available at the present time, nor is there any possibility of our securing them unless it is by direct appropriation. I have a memorandum here from the Forest Service to which I have already referred, and I shall read the reference that he makes in this statement.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is a fact, is it not, that the total recommended by the Forest Service for six New England States, broken down by States, amounts to approximately \$8,000,000?

Mr. TREADWAY. The original request of the Forest Service was for \$8,000,000 for use in the States, and then I think \$870,000 for the national forest in New Hampshire, but that was cut down by the Budget from \$8,000,000 to \$5,000,000 and by the committee to \$3,000,000. The telegram from the Governor says that it would require \$3,000,000 in Massachusetts alone to clean up the fire hazard.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. And still leave the emergency features of the work.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; absolutely. I call the attention of the House now to this memorandum which I received from Mr. Tinker, the assistant forester:

MEMORANDUM TO MR. TREADWAY

1. When the Forest Service was precipitated into the hurricane disaster work in New England by order of the President the State conservation agencies were called into consultation in Boston and a definite plan of hazard elimination developed and agreed upon. State projects, involving the use of available W. P. A. facilities, were submitted and acted upon immediately. These resulted in 15,000 to 17,000 men being employed on hazard-elimination work, a totally inadequate number, but the maximum that could be utilized in areas accessible to the sources of supply of labor. All of the C. C. C. camps administered by the Forest Service, State agencies, and the Park Service were turned over to the coordinating agency and their efforts directed toward hazard elimination.

2. Realizing the necessity for proper supervision and direction, the Forest Service drew upon its resources of experienced personnel, established an office in Boston to assume direct responsibility for the operations, and employed field technicians through the W. P. A. to exercise technical direction over the hazard-elimination operations and to inventory the extent of the damage, the hazard, and the requirements to meet the catastrophe.

3. As a result of the action taken, an integrated program of hazard elimination has been developed in cooperation with the State agencies, and something over 20,000 men have expended their efforts in an attempt to reduce the hazard to normal. This program has required planning, organization work on a tremendous scale, and constant supervision. It could have been accomplished in no other way than through the detail of experienced Forest Service personnel to the job. It can be carried on in no other way. The State agencies were totally unprepared to cope with a disaster of such proportions.

4. The hurricane damage in New England was not confined to ruined forests. There was a tremendous loss of property of all kinds, and the States were overwhelmed in their attempt to repair the effects of wind and flood. Towns utilized all possible labor in clearing away debris, in repairing sewer and water systems. The burden of men and money fell heavily on towns and States.

5. The fire-hazard reduction work being directed by the Forest Service covers some 600 towns in the stricken area. In nearly all of these towns committees have been organized and have been occupied with aiding in the fire-hazard reduction, giving of their time and money freely.

6. In Mr. Tinker's memorandum to you dated December 22 he wrote as follows:

"The fire-hazard reduction work has proceeded under severe limitations. Unfortunately, W. P. A. has not been able to furnish us anything like the required number of men. The estimated force required was 39,000, whereas at the peak in late November only 18,000 men were obtained. Fire-hazard conditions in New England as they will exist next spring cannot be exaggerated. To anyone who has been in the disaster area the thought of the possibilities of a disaster even greater than the hurricane is appalling. The timber-salvage work this winter will appreciably reduce the fire hazard, but in spite of this, under the limitations that now exist in elimination work, the situation next spring will represent a very real menace to the public safety."

"If the above-enumerated measures are not taken and fires are not adequately handled during the coming spring fire season, I predict there will be loss of life and property throughout the path of this hurricane equal and even beyond that done by the storm itself. I feel a tremendous responsibility in all these undertakings and feel that all influential and thinking people should be properly apprised of the exact situation and then prepare to prevent these things from happening."

7. The Forest Service estimates that there is a gross area affected by the hurricane of about 14,000,000 acres in the New England States needing protection, with about 150,000 acres of blown-down timber where intensive fire-hazard reduction work over a period of almost 2 years will be needed to reduce the hazard to normal. There are about 1,200 miles of roads to be opened and about 950 miles of telephone lines and five lookout towers to be constructed.

To make possible quick action for fire suppression it will be necessary to organize, in conjunction with the States, fire-suppression and fire-fighting crews to be ready to act expeditiously. The necessary fire-fighting equipment must be purchased and located at strategic points throughout the area and the organized crews instructed in the use of this equipment. All of this organization is for protective purposes while the work of removing the blown-down timber is being carried on. Our minimum plan calls for about 7,500 temporary employees to carry on fire-hazard reduction. This force includes patrolmen, foremen, straw bosses, and about 5,800 laborers. This force is in addition to the C. C. C. camps and whatever W. P. A. labor can be secured for use in areas accessible to such labor.

Now, as to precedents for this sort of an appropriation, the very next item in the bill, Mr. Chairman, is for relief from grasshoppers—an item where the Federal Government is to aid people who have grasshoppers on their property. Well, I cannot conceive of grasshoppers being as serious a menace to anybody's property as such a fire hazard as I am showing the pictures of here today. I have been along the highways in my own district and they are in no way other than correct representations even for miles in extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have a little memorandum here of where the Federal Government has aided in other lines to relieve distress and troubles: The foot-and-mouth disease, cattle tick, grasshoppers, tuberculosis in cattle, contagious abortions, Mediterranean fruitfly, corn borer, boll weevil, stem rust. All those things have to do with agricultural situations, and this situation I am describing has just as much to do with agriculture, because these people who own this down timber are practically all farmers. They are not simply timber owners but their actual assets are all lying flat on the ground today. It certainly is not an unreasonable appeal that we are making to the Federal Government to relieve this distressed situation in New England. I cannot conceive of a reduction being made by the Appropriations Committee. If Mr. Silcox and his department, or we, as the representatives of this affected area, fail in our duty to the committee in providing the necessary information on which to base its decision to give sufficient money for this purpose, let us have an opportunity of supplying that information at some further hearing.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fair statement to say that the fire hazard of which the gentleman speaks extends to towns and cities and entire communities in the New England States?

Mr. TREADWAY. The memorandum which the Forest Service gave me, which I will extend in the RECORD, shows how worried they are that this fire hazard will just sweep New England. It is just as likely to start at Long Island Sound and go right through this whole area as did the hurricane originally. The number of industries, cities, communities and people endangered—the number of deaths that will result from such a calamity are inestimable. I cannot conceive of cutting down an appropriation where humanitarian work is as much required as it is here.

I do not know how this \$3,000,000 is broken down and what part of it is going to Massachusetts, but Massachusetts alone would need more than that amount, in accordance with the word I have from the Governor. But we are not going to argue about allotting this entire sum to Massachusetts alone. It is a New England problem, and the appropriation ought to be made sufficient to cover New England. I am not familiar with the statutes of other States, but if we cannot, under our State constitution, match dollar for dollar, it is unfair, it seems to me, to make that a condition under which any money will be given to Massachusetts by the Federal Government. I feel very strongly that at least that feature ought to be eliminated, and let Members from other States quote what the laws and constitutions may be in their respective States.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am told by Members that the laws in certain States may not allow them to contribute. They probably can only contribute a small amount in any event.

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not feel qualified to speak for other States. I am speaking for New England as a whole, anxious to see this disaster condition removed from New England as a whole. But I do feel that we in Massachusetts ought to have special consideration in view of the constitutional provision to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts ought to emphasize the fact that the bill before the committee today is not concerned with the purchase of timber, but confines itself only to the fire hazard.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am glad the gentleman called attention to that, because he and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and I all have similar bills asking for additional money for the purchase of this timber. That has nothing to do with the question under consideration at this time. We are discussing only the fire hazard and the fire possibilities of the future in today's appeal to Congress.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. Does the gentleman think that even the amount recommended in this bill is sufficient to do that?

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, it would not cover Massachusetts alone, but we have to divide it up, in fairness to the other States and our hope in the fairness of Congress to make an additional appropriation for all of us.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER. Is it not true that unless this fire menace is cleared up the tremendous investment the Federal Government now has in the White Mountain National Forest will be jeopardized by any forest fires that might start?

Mr. TREADWAY. I may say further that every bit of this money will be used for labor. It is to be used for nothing except cleaning up this slash and fire hazard. The question of unemployment, therefore, is vitally involved also. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to congratulate the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the early action it has taken with reference to dealing with a subject that is of prime importance to us in the territory I represent, namely, eastern Montana.

So that you will have some sort of picture in mind as to this territory, I may say that we have large farm units, great grazing territories on which no human being lives. These areas are so vast that it is difficult to deal with them effectively when the grasshoppers become promiscuous. Attention must be given to these pests early in the season to be effective.

A few dollars spent early in the spring will accomplish much more than perhaps five times that amount spent later. We are already receiving warnings as to what is going on in eastern Montana. I shall read from an Associated Press dispatch from Broadus, Mont., the Powder River country—and I think everybody here has heard of Powder River.

I wish to insert the following Associated Press dispatch which appeared in the Billings Gazette, Billings, Mont., on January 14:

BROADUS, January 14.—Ranchers in Powder River County have started their 1939 Mormon cricket worries.

Mild weather caused an early hatching of the destructive pests, and Guy Nash, rancher, living 9 miles west of here, declared he could "collect tubs full" of them if his word was doubted.

Ranchers hope the early hatched crickets will be caught in an expected cold wave and destroyed.

If that does not happen, namely, cold weather sets in, Mr. Chairman, it is going to be a mighty serious problem in this territory. I wish to say to those of you who have not seen Mormon crickets and are not familiar with them that they are a mighty destructive cannibalistic insect, or whatever you call them. It would remind you of the old craw-daddy that we as children used to see in the swamps along the Missouri River. They are so ferocious that Indian legend has it that the Mormon cricket is the reincarnation of the buffalo returning to vent its wrath for the wholesale slaughter of the buffalo decades ago. You will recall, as history tells us, the infestation of the Mormon crickets on lands cultivated by the Mormons in Utah in such numbers that destruction of their crops was imminent. You will recall also that history informs us that the sea gull, the sacred bird of the Mormons, gorged itself with these crickets in the fields and then carried them to the middle of what is known as Great Salt Lake and there disgorged them, returning to the field to repeat the operation. That is why today we have a statue of a sea gull in Salt Lake City commemorating its service to humanity. In order that you may have some idea of how the campaign of destruction on these pests works, the Government buys the bait, sends it to each county. There it is mixed and the farmers come and take the bait and distribute it where it will do the most good. As a matter of fact, the State and the farmers perhaps equally match in work and money the amount expended by the Federal Government.

I wish to insert, at this point, a telegram received by me from H. B. Mills, Montana State entomologist, as follows:

Have information for Montana only. Seven thousand eight hundred and thirty-seven tons bait needed for crops compared with 5,018 last year. Further need 6,280 tons for idle land and 8,824 for range, total 19,241. Increase 14,223, or 300 percent necessary to expand program to reduce possibility of vast migrations which cost Montana over six million last year. Cannot adequately plan for campaign unless total needed available in advance of season. Lee A. Strong, Chief, Bureau of Entomology, in Washington can give you picture of general situation.

And I got in touch with Dr. Strong, and he did.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; I yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. What percentage of the money appropriated by Congress is spent for this bait the gentleman speaks of? Is it not largely spent for bait?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Practically all of the money Congress appropriates is spent for bait with the exception of what is used for the construction of miles of tin barriers to prevent the crickets crawling on uninfested areas. The cost of transportation and distribution is borne by the farmers.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. In other words, then, the localities themselves are contributing at least as much as the Federal Government toward the eradication of this pest?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is virtually correct when we consider the help furnished by the State and the cash contributions or work done by the farmers and the transportation of the bait to the place of intended use.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. If the statement made by the gentleman is correct, then, perhaps, instead of \$2,000,000, the proper figure would be nearer \$6,000,000?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It would be. The Bureau of Entomology, which makes a study of these matters, which has to do with the expending of this fund, recommended to the Bureau of the Budget the sum of \$6,000,000. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in turn, recommended to Congress the appropriation of \$3,300,000.

This recommendation was made in view of the fact, I understand, that some \$700,000 was left over from the amount appropriated last year. Congress does not need to be afraid of appropriating this sum, for it will not be spent unless emergency condition makes it necessary. The very fact that there was a carry-over from last year shows how carefully the fund is administered.

We have heard much talk about different menaces here this morning, and I do not want to mitigate anything the gentleman from Massachusetts has said about fire hazard, because we have seen fire in Montana, and too, we have seen the C. C. boys, without fear, disregarding the danger to their lives, and in many instances losing their lives, fight their way into the mountainous regions to extinguish, in a short time, a conflagration which was raging in our virgin forests.

When, however, it comes down to real injury and damage, the pests I am talking about, the grasshoppers, are the real menace to the agriculturist and they destroy vegetation and crops. They rise in clouds so thick as virtually to obscure the rays of the sun. They light in a field in the morning, and by nightfall it is stripped of its grain, and all vegetation.

These Mormon crickets, my friends, are worse than grasshoppers. I do not know whether they come from the Mormon territory or not, but wherever they come from they are a serious menace. I may say I never saw them in Montana until the last few years and they absolutely destroy everything they touch, not only crops, but garments, fence posts, and so forth.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to my good friend the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What makes the gentleman think the crickets are more destructive than the grasshoppers?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Because they are larger. Has my friend ever seen a Mormon cricket?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Has the gentleman ever seen an old-fashioned craw-daddy in the swamps?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. With those long tentacles?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I fully realize the destructiveness of the grasshoppers and the crickets, and though I have not seen the crickets, I have heard them discussed on the floor of this House and elsewhere and have read up on the subject; and I know that crickets really do more damage than grasshoppers do, as they are larger, move more slowly, and destroy more thoroughly. Does not the gentleman think that the amount recommended by the Department, namely, \$6,000,000, should be restored in this bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I should think so. I am going to propose an amendment which I think the House should seriously consider.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I agree with the gentleman; crickets and grasshoppers are extremely destructive.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have the figures on the amount of money used for the destruction of the grasshoppers and crickets in each State. In Montana \$12,519 of Federal funds were used for destroying grasshoppers.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Was that not entirely inadequate?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Entirely so. The sum of \$151,578.79 was used in Montana to take care of the cricket problem. In other words, the Mormon crickets are a more serious menace to our crops in Montana than the grasshoppers.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In New Mexico we have voluntary brigades. We have the National Guard, and we have hundreds of men from the W. P. A. The destruction ran into hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct. I cannot estimate the damage these pests do to us. As a matter of fact, when the crops are taken from the farmers, what happens? We have to come before this Congress and appeal to the Congress for an appropriation to keep our people from starving and freezing to death. This happens not only in Montana but all of these Northwestern States. It will only take a few dollars here to guard against this serious situation.

Last spring, as pointed out by the Bureau of Entomology, the crickets and the grasshoppers were destroyed, but later on in the season, about May, there rose into the heavens clouds of grasshoppers which came from the Dakotas into Montana and destroyed crops that were valued by the Bureau of Entomology at the sum of \$6,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to contribute something to the gentleman's statement, which is very valuable, especially to us who come from districts in which grasshoppers have done considerable damage. I have a telegram from the president of the Nebraska Crop Growers' Association who believes they should have \$6,000,000. May I ask the gentleman if he does not believe that unless the larger amount is appropriated, the one or two million dollars is practically wasted? Does not the gentleman think that the larger amount, with a real, expert program to take care of the entire insect situation, would solve the problem better than a smaller appropriation?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know why they did not use the \$700,000 which they have on hand?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Apparently it came too late.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The problem, while it is your immediate problem, is a matter of concern to the whole country?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right, because what concerns us in Montana concerns every State in the Union. If we lose our crops in Montana, Wyoming, and the Dakotas, we will have to come down here to Congress and my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], than whom there is no more courteous, able, and influential Member on the floor of this House, will help us get an appropriation to feed our people. So it is your concern and it is the concern of every member of this Committee.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I was impressed with the gentleman's statement a moment ago, as well as the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. The gentleman stated he did not want to detract from the plea made by our friends from New England.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. And he further stated that this is a matter of concern to the entire country. We have only a little of this pest, thank God, in Arizona, but I understand there are 24 States of the Union bothered to some extent with this same situation. I would like to call the Committee's attention to the fact there are dynamic hazards as well as potential hazards. The fire hazard is a potential hazard. When you are dealing with insects you are dealing with a destructive force that some scientists tell us is likely to conquer the world and is worse than militarism among humans. You are dealing with a very dynamic hazard and it directly affects more than half the States of this Union.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not think the gentleman has finished his discussion as to the amount necessary for the eradication of these insects. The gentleman is correct in stating this is a national problem, but I still believe if we are going to appropriate only one or two million dollars we are wasting the money unless we appropriate a sufficient amount to completely cover the situation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. We should appropriate a larger amount; that will take care of the situation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The Committee on Appropriations may answer that by stating that when the demand arises Congress will act. You know what happens here. You know that you cannot get any bill through the House that is controversial in nature without extended debate. It takes time. Why not have some confidence in the Department that has the administration of this fund and give such an amount at this time as will enable the Department to carry on an effective campaign to destroy these pests, in case of an emergency, which are the greatest of menaces to the West. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much impressed and very much stirred by the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, and also by the gentleman from Montana. I am in entire sympathy with their appeals. What they are asking, of course, is of a constructive character.

However, there are other things than grasshoppers and crickets that are hazards to the people of this country, and other things than hurricanes and fires. Sometimes, perhaps, in an unguarded moment we are responsible for certain devastating legislation that brings great injury to large numbers of persons in this country.

I recall that when the campaign was on in 1932 things became very tense, and farmers all over this country were listening to the campaign speeches made at that time because they were deeply concerned with possible legislation that might be placed on the statute books in the event of the election of one candidate or the other. At that time the farmers, and particularly the dairymen and the cattlemen, were very eager to know just what would be the fate of the tariff rates on farm products if Franklin D. Roosevelt were elected President and his party put in power. I imagine many communications were received by President Roosevelt, then Candidate Roosevelt, urging him to state his position on the question of the tariff on farm products. At any rate, on October 25, 1932, he spoke in Baltimore, and millions of men listened intently to what he had to say. At that time he made this statement:

It is absurd to talk of lowering tariff duties on farm products. I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer in the United States knows it and will not be deceived.

It is quite evident from the majority Mr. Roosevelt received, especially in the farm sections, that the people relied on his assurance that the tariff duties on farm products would not be reduced. All the farmers knew was that he had made that assertion and that promise. They did not know

how easily he would break that promise, as many other promises have been broken, if trusted with power.

I invite the attention of the Members of the House, and especially those representing farm interests, to the fact that it was not long after Mr. Roosevelt became President of the United States that he asked Congress to delegate certain powers to him to exercise through the Secretary of State in the handling of tariff duties. The power he requested was delegated to him. The result was a series of trade agreements with various countries. Among these trade agreements was one entered into with our neighbor to the north, Canada. Tariff duties were reduced in that agreement. He could go only as far as the statute permitted, which was a 50-percent reduction of the rates in the 1930 Tariff Act; but later, under a second agreement, he reduced the duty on cattle, dairy cows, cream, whole milk, white seed potatoes, and white potatoes the full 50 percent, just as low, in fact, as the statute permitted him to go.

My statement would not be complete unless I gave some evidence of the effect of the lowering of these duties. The fact is that imports of cattle from Canada increased 56 percent from 1935 to 1936. Then from 1936 to 1937 there was an increase of 66 percent, or an increase from 1935 to 1937 of 122 percent. These increases in imports occurred under the first trade agreement with Canada; but now a new trade agreement with Canada has been entered into which not only further reduces the rates but increases the quotas of cattle and dairy cows that may enter our market.

The American farmer faces a serious situation. When we consider that imports of cattle from Canada under the old trade agreement exceeded the quota by more than 67,000 head it is safe to assume that under the new trade agreement, with lower rates of duty and enlarged quotas, the number of imported cattle from Canada will increase to the full quota limit. I may say we are feeling the effects in our markets up in the North. Our farmers have gone into Buffalo and cooled their heels for hours while Canadian trucks were being unloaded and the Canadians were underselling them in the Buffalo market. This has been true all along the border.

I wish to discuss another item. We reduced the duty on cream.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I ask the gentleman whether or not he has had occasion to observe the conditions along the New England border?

Mr. REED of New York. I shall be pleased to answer the question.

Mr. BREWSTER. During the hearings before the Committee for Reciprocity Information Mr. Grady, the chairman, stated he had secured a concession from Canada by allowing potatoes from the United States to enter Canada free of duty. I should like to ask the gentleman whether or not the fact we can send potatoes to Canada free of duty is calculated to offset the devastating effect of the importation of some millions of bushels of Canadian potatoes into the American market?

Mr. REED of New York. I am very glad to reply to that question.

Occasionally for educational purposes to see what our good neighbors are doing and since I live not very far away from the Canadian line I have taken trips into various parts of Canada. Last year in the early part of September, I drove up through that great potato empire in Maine, Aroostook County, which is so ably represented by the gentleman who has just propounded the inquiry. Proceeding up through that great territory, with its wonderful storage houses, fertile fields, and its farm machinery, and where I saw more potato fields than I had supposed existed in the United States of America, I went across the Canadian border. The people on that side of the border have the same fertile land and produce the same types and grades of potatoes as are

produced in Maine. In talking with a very distinguished and well-informed man in a small city in Maine located on our northern border I made some inquiries of him with regard to conditions at that time, and as I recall it—and if I am not correct the gentleman from Maine will correct me—buyers were then offering only 35 cents a barrel for first-grade potatoes raised in Aroostook County. Is that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is right.

Mr. REED of New York. The farmers were in a desperate plight and I said to this well-informed gentleman, "Can you compete?" and he said: "No; the cost of production in Canada is so much lower; I own land on both sides of the border, the same kind of land, one just as fertile as the other and," he said, "my taxes on the land on the Maine side are \$60 a year while the same amount of land used for the same purpose on the Canadian side is taxed \$2," and he said further: "You will notice why this is true when you enter Canada."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 10 additional minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. I drove up along that border and through Canada; on the other side the roads were inferior, the schools were inferior, the pupils or parents had to furnish their own books and supplies in the schools, and in driving along the border on a Sunday for a distance of 100 miles, we counted the number of horses and buggies which we met and counted over 500 horses and buggies and noted that the churchyards were filled with horses and buggies, and we met only 25 automobiles.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then the gentleman would think that this reciprocal trade policy is nicely calculated to send us back to the "horse and buggy" age?

Mr. REED of New York. It is inevitable that if we raise our cost of production here to a point beyond the cost of production abroad, they are going to take our markets, and if they take our markets we face the proposition that we must accept a lower standard of living unless we are prepared to protect our own market. Have I answered the gentleman's question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. I am very much indebted to the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. Let me go a little bit further. We have gradually reduced the tariff on cream, and in driving through there I saw the preparations being made to take advantage of these lower tariff rates, and to show you how unfair they have been in these trade agreements, which have lowered the tariff on cream from 56 and a fraction cents a gallon to 28¾ cents, in driving through one of the dairy sections of Canada along toward evening at milking time there was a downpour of rain. The milk cans were standing out in the open field and 25 or 30 men would be milking at one time out in the rain with the rain pouring down over the backs of the cows and running into the pails or soaking through the felt hats and sweaters of these men and then running into the milk pails. There are no sanitary restrictions in these trade agreements. You can go up into New York State or along the border in Wisconsin and see the sanitary requirements adding to the cost of production of our farmers, and yet this milk or cream comes in from Canada under the conditions I have mentioned with all this filth and disease germs to be sold in our markets.

It is not difficult to predict the effect which the lowering of the duty on cream will have on the volume imported. I need mention only what occurred when the duty on cream during the first half of 1929 was 20 cents a gallon. Under that law duty imports of cream in the first half of 1929 were 2,964,189 gallons. When the duty was raised by Presidential proclamation, effective June 13, 1929, Canada exported to the United States during the next 6 months only 1,942,704 gallons of cream. The Tariff Act of 1930 increased the duty on cream

to 56½ cents a gallon; the imports of cream from Canada dropped to 117,168 gallons.

Where is this going to end? Must we pauperize our farmers by whittling away our protection through these trade agreements? There is not a man on the floor of this House, not one, who would have dared vote for a bill brought into this House seeking to lower these duties as they have been lowered by these trade agreements, and yet we have given away the rights of a sovereign people and placed them in the hands of bureaucrats under a Department of this Government that would not dare go to the people and ask for their suffrage upon their record made by these trade agreements. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] will tell me whether or not he is in favor of this bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of this bill. There is an item in there which should not be there, and when you spend three and a half million dollars on a deficiency appropriation bill to construct a new building, that is contrary to sound legislation and I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. How about the \$3,000,000 for the New England States?

Mr. RICH. The gentleman asked me if I was in favor of the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. How about that item? The three million for New England.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman gets down to specific items I will answer in respect to specific items. There are some things that we are in favor of and some things that we are opposed to, and the gentleman from Missouri knows very well that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was never found wanting in expressing his opinion one way or the other, yes or no.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman seems to be found wanting now, and if he is in favor of that item, then I want to ask him where are we going to get the money. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Not now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Let me tell him where we will get the money.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not yield. In reference to the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] concerning the three and a half million dollars for the Census Bureau, I have been trying for many years to get this Congress to authorize an appropriation to construct a concrete building, not any marble structure, nor one out of Indiana limestone, somewhere in the southwest section where we can store all of what might be called the inactive files of this Government.

Mr. RICH. I say to the gentleman that that is a mighty sensible thing to recommend, and I hope that sometime it will be constructed.

Mr. COCHRAN. If that kind of a building is constructed, I predict that 40 percent of the space now occupied by Government agencies in the city of Washington will be released for desks. Old files only used occasionally should be removed from the beautiful buildings and placed in what I would call a warehouse—stored where the file clerks can get their hands on them quickly and send them up to the department whenever it is necessary. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced that bill again this year, and I have taken the floor to again call attention to it. I shall ask the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to give me a hearing. I have already had one hearing. There was a conference where the committee was appointed to decide as to whether or not it was desirable to construct that building.

A majority of those on this committee were in favor of the warehouse, but it finally ended up in putting three and a half million dollars more in The Archives Building, constructing

stacks in the center of that building. That three and a half million dollars would have constructed the type of building that I have referred to—space to be set aside for every department and independent establishment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. It is an absolute necessity, as the gentleman should know, to have a place for the Census Bureau to work. The Constitution says we must take the census every 10 years. Now, I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I say—and I have said on the floor time and time again—that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] knows how to save money for the Government, if he will only do it, and being a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments it ought to be his duty to do it, not only here but every place. His suggestion is a mighty fine one, and if Members will look at the hearings on this bill, on page 10, they will see where we are spending money for rentals at the rate of \$22,745 for 1,830 square feet of space for Government buildings, and a great part of that is being used for files. Nothing in the world would be more desirable than what the gentleman is now recommending, and he will find the gentleman from Pennsylvania supporting him and voting for a bill of that kind.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman. The committee of which I am the chairman has no jurisdiction over the bill that I have introduced. If it did, I would have had it reported long ago. As I said, the Census Bureau must have a place to work. The Census Bureau files are going to be always active from now on, because they are being used every day by every State in the Union in checking up the age of applicants for old-age assistance. You cannot put those files in the Archives Bureau. You have to put them in a warehouse. Then you have the record of every man that served in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps since their inception. They are not in the Archives. Some of them are even stored at Governors Island, N. Y. You have historical documents from the World War that are stored at Governors Island, N. Y. You have files of this Government, valuable files, in hundreds of places. The General Accounting Office alone has 14 different places where it is now storing its documents. You cannot conceive the damage that would result if they were destroyed by fire. The necessity for this warehouse is apparent.

In conclusion, I say this. I do not know whether I am going to be able to be here tomorrow, but if I am I am not going to support this \$3,000,000 appropriation.

Those who have suffered have my sympathy. I also was in sympathy with the million W. P. A. workers who are going off the W. P. A. rolls unless the Senate restores the \$875,000,000 asked by the administration. Many who are very active in support of this item did not have the same view on the W. P. A. appropriation as I had, but voted for the reduction of \$125,000,000. That, however, has nothing to do with my opposition to this appropriation.

We have, from time to time, I know, assisted others in distress but consult the record and you will see it was loans, not grants. It is the principle I fear. Using the language of some of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle when they were opposing some so-called New Deal measures, "just another experiment, I suppose." Well it is a very dangerous experiment, and one you are going to hear from at some future date.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if I am here tomorrow I am not going to support it. My reason is that I believe we are establishing a policy that will come back to plague us. Every time you have a disaster in this country, due to an act of God, you will have Members from that section of the country saying, "Well, look what you did for the New England States. Do the same for us."

I will vote for an authorization to loan the people of the New England States \$10,000,000, if necessary, but I will not vote to hand them \$3,000,000 without any strings attached to its whatsoever, other than it be matched by the States. It is simply a gift, so when you do this for the New England

States, remember you are going to do it for other parts of the country.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I notice in the papers that at the time of this disaster the W. P. A. was very active in the expenditure of funds. I wonder if the hearings disclose how much money was spent by them at that time?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is covered in the hearings, I understand.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman said it was not within the jurisdiction of the committee to prevent the expenditures to construct this building. I want the gentleman to tell the House, especially the new Members, just what the committee's jurisdiction is.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows the jurisdiction of the committee. He is the ranking member on the minority side. He knows what the jurisdiction is. But I will say among our duties is to investigate the executive branch of the Government at any time any Member of this House lays before the committee any concrete evidence of fraud or waste. I have told the gentleman on this floor time and time again that whenever he will put the evidence on the table that will warrant an investigation he can have it, but not before.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is, if we bring the skunk and lay it there you will help us smell it, but you would not try to catch the skunk. [Laughter.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Well, the gentleman brought in one skunk. He made so many speeches that finally Mr. Hopkins said to me, "COCHRAN, I am tired of you defending me on the floor of the House. I will come down." I brought him down. The gentleman from Massachusetts had his opportunity, and if ever I felt sorry for a man in my life I felt sorry for my friend from Massachusetts when Mr. Hopkins got through. [Laughter.]

Mr. GIFFORD. I was sorry for myself. I never was so insulted. Every Democratic member of the committee rushed to the defense of Hopkins. I was not allowed to proceed hardly at all.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, if you will read the hearings, nobody had a chance to say anything but the gentleman from Massachusetts. [Laughter.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Are the hearings in print?

Mr. COCHRAN. Certainly.

Mr. GIFFORD. Has the gentleman any copies left?

Mr. COCHRAN. I believe we have some. I do not know. They were so uninteresting that I do not know whether they are there or not. I will look, and if I find one I will send the gentleman a copy.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman will acknowledge that is the only day, 1 day in 6 years, and no one else has been allowed to come before the committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. But the gentleman has never laid the evidence on the table.

Mr. GIFFORD. I or no one else could produce evidence enough for his committee to act.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not deal in skunks. I did not investigate your administration during the last 2 years of Hoover. I was fair. I am not going to investigate my own unless facts warranting an investigation are placed before me. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help addressing myself to the remarks of the President of the United States on January 4 on the state of the Nation. He made this statement:

And we still intend to do our own thinking.
We still intend to do our own thinking.

Now the question in my mind is, does he expect the Congress to do its own thinking, or does the President, Cohen, Corcoran, and company, expect to do the thinking and send

the bills to Congress for us to rubber stamp? I can hardly think that is possible. I do not believe the Members of Congress will rubber stamp any more legislation, and I think we will see different legislation in the House during this session than we have seen before during the New Deal administration of F. D. Roosevelt.

On yesterday I asked the majority leader a question about Government finances, and the insinuation was, "Where are we going to get the money?" He did not want to reply to me, or at least he did not. I feel that today the responsibility for the operation of this Government devolves upon the membership of Congress, especially the leaders of the majority party. When I pick up the Treasury statement of January 16, and I think of the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, and the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, and others, and when I think of the importance of the offices which those men hold with the majority party, I say to you as Members of Congress, it is up to the men I have just mentioned to lead the way and show the people of this country we are going to economize in our Government spending. It can easily be done—should and must.

I call your attention to the fact that the Democratic Party in its platform of 1932 said:

We will abolish useless commissions and offices, consolidate departments and bureaus, and eliminate extravagances to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of government.

I now call attention to the remarks of the President of the United States on March 10, 1933, when he addressed the Congress as follows:

For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy. With the utmost seriousness I pointed out to the Congress the profound effect of this upon our national economy. Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger.

The Hoover administration in the 3 years the President talked about went into the red \$3,500,000,000, but after 6 years of his administration he has put the country in debt \$20,000,000,000. What does Mr. Roosevelt think of his economy measures? I know what I think of them, as well as millions of other American citizens. It is a crime against our American civilization for a man in high and responsible public office to tell you he will do one thing when he gets in office and then to repudiate his word when he does get in. It is almost inconceivable that he could change so completely around. No stretch of the imagination could give a logical and businesslike reason.

I call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the condition of the Treasury as shown by the Treasury statement of January 16, published by the Treasury Department, Mr. Morgenthau's secretary. We find that we have gold to the extent of \$14,594,000,000 belonging to the Government. Where is it stored? In a hole in the ground down in Kentucky. And they are storing the silver of this country in a hole in the ground up at West Point. This story of buried treasure reminds me of the old story that when you hide your treasures they are of no value. This is where we find ourselves today so far as our gold and silver are concerned. It is of no value. It is in the hands of the President of the United States only, and he can use it at any time he sees fit. Be careful he does not declare an emergency exists before he goes out of office and he will be the sole controller and I might say sole owner.

Looking at this Treasury statement again, I am shocked to find that the Government has a balance of \$3,000,000,000 lying in the banks of this country on which the taxpayers are paying interest. Why under the sun is it necessary for the Secretary of the Treasury to carry such a balance? It was never thought of or dreamed of by Secretaries of the Treasury before Mr. Morgenthau came into office. Why is it necessary today? There is a reason, but it is not a good one—let him answer it; I have asked the question a number of times, but no answer.

Let me call attention further to the fact that since July 1 the taxpayers of this country have paid \$3,087,000,000. Against that receipt you have expended \$4,920,000,000. This shows that we have gone in the red, since July 1 last, to the extent of \$1,833,000,000. We will be close to four billion in the red by the end of the year. Terrible, horrible, unexcusable, unbusinesslike, unheard of in peacetime. It shows to our people this administration knows nothing of running the Government.

A few years ago the President of the United States talked about a balanced Budget. He has forgotten that phrase today. He says nothing about it, and he knows nothing about it.

WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

If we keep traveling in the direction we are now going, it will be but a few years until our Government will experience the greatest wreck ever seen in the history of the world, and our children and children's children will suffer for the folly of this administration.

The establishment of a policy of responsibility and economy in government, Mr. Chairman, belongs to this Congress. The majority party promised economy in government. You promised to consolidate departments. You have had this opportunity for 6 years. Instead, however, of making that promise good, you did the very opposite.

In 1932, on November 4, in Brooklyn, N. Y., the President of the United States stated:

The people of America demand a reduction of Federal expenditures. It can be accomplished not only by reducing the expenditures of existing departments, but it can be done by abolishing many useless commissions, bureaus, and functions; and it can be done by consolidating many activities of government.

After making that statement what did the President of the United States do? He established more bureaus than any other administration in the history of our Nation. At the time he took office we had 63 separate and distinct bureaus of government. He has established 61 additional bureaus and commissions. Is that the kind of reduction he promised? Think of it, men; it is a serious question.

We have a law on our statute books forbidding the Federal Government going into debt beyond \$45,000,000,000. We shall soon reach that limit of indebtedness. Before long you will have presented to the Committee on Ways and Means a bill asking that the permissible debt of the United States be increased to \$80,000,000,000.

I say to you Members of Congress that if you want to assume the responsibilities of government, if you want to assert your rights as American citizens and do the thing you ought to do, never let this resolution pass with Mr. Roosevelt in the White House. It is to be hoped that one of these major committees, the Speaker of the House, or the majority leader will try to and be successful in forcing economy in the affairs of Government. Such a bill should not pass. Every Member should rise on this floor and say, "Such a bill shall never pass under present conditions this Congress."

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. I am much in sympathy with what the gentleman says, but I wish you would tell us his remedy. How are we going to take care of the unemployed? The gentleman stands simply for cutting down taxes and cutting down appropriations. Do not do it. Are we going to extend the wage and hour legislation, or what are we going to do to take care of men that have not got jobs?

Mr. RICH. Let me give the gentleman the answer. The gentleman has asked an appropriate question and I can tell him the answer. The first thing necessary to be done is to restore confidence amongst the businessmen of this country.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. That does not put food into hungry stomachs.

[Here the gavel fell].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Restore confidence amongst the businessmen of the country, so that private capital will not be afraid to venture into business. If you do this, you will be doing something that will put 300 men to work where you now put 1 man to work on the Government pay roll. We will put food in their stomachs and sunshine in their hearts, clothes on their backs, and happiness in the home.

Another thing to do is to get people off the Government pay roll at \$50 a month and get them back into industry, where they can make \$100 a month. The good, sound men of this country want jobs, not dole. The American with red blood in his veins says, "Give me a job, and I will go to work." This administration, however, tries to prohibit their working by ill-conceived laws.

Another thing you can do is to change the N. L. R. B. Act and the Wagner Act so that the businessmen and industrial men of this Nation can feel they have some rights in their own plants and that there is some opportunity ahead. It requires a business executive to run a business, and not a rabble rouser. They only breed discontent and destroy. If the businessman makes too much money, we can hold him down by the income tax, and we can by law regulate his earnings, but when we kill opportunity, we destroy all. We kill business; we destroy jobs. Confidence is lost. Government of the people and by the people is destroyed.

Let us stop these reciprocal-trade agreements. Let us keep the agricultural industry of this country for our own farmers and our own laborers instead of permitting foreign goods to come in here to usurp all of our markets—the best in the world. If we will do that, I will say to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE], we will put these men back to work and we will have a satisfied, happy, contented people in this country. I hope the Members of Congress will use their own minds instead of expecting the President of the United States to do everything for them. If we follow this policy we will go places, we will make this country a happy, contented country, and we will be doing that which is for the best interests of all the American people.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. That is no answer to the problem. The machines are busy. These men are out of work and they can never go back to work. The gentleman cannot find work for them.

Mr. RICH. Let us regulate mass production then so we can give them jobs and not permit machinery to do everything. Men need jobs in order to do something. Idleness breeds discontent. Idleness makes men shiftless and lazy. If the gentleman wants to regulate mass production, let him offer a bill.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. The gentleman does not point the way.

Mr. RICH. None is so blind as he who will not see.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, there is an item in the pending bill for the construction of another Federal building and, while it is necessary in the scheme of things, yet I suppose this would be a most appropriate time to call the attention of the members of this Committee and the Members of the House to the tremendous program of Federal construction that has been carried on since 1933.

A botanist measures the age of a tree by the number of rings. I suppose the size of the Government and its present status, so far as functions are concerned, can be measured by the amount of new construction that has taken place since 1933. Some of the figures you will find in the hearings which accompany this bill, but all of the important information is not contained therein, particularly that which relates to construction and rentals outside the District of Columbia.

There is a statement in the hearings to the effect we are renting within the confines of the District of Columbia today 120 buildings or portions thereof, with a total available space

of approximately three and one-half million square feet. I put it in that fashion because it will be easy to compare, and I think the figures bear emphasis. There are 120 leased buildings, containing three and two-thirds or three and one-half million square feet for which we pay an annual rental in the Nation's Capital of about three and one-half million dollars. Of course, that is not the whole story as we consider the proposal to appropriate in excess of \$3,000,000 for the building of a new building to be occupied by the Bureau of the Census in anticipation of the taking of the next census. It is rather interesting to see how buildings have accumulated over a period of time and to note that in and of themselves they have been insufficient to house the various governmental activities.

I received some figures from the Procurement Division this morning which I think will be interesting. I suppose some of the Members of the House do not know that in addition to the three and one-half-million-odd square feet that we rent in the Nation's Capital, we also lease almost 26,000,000 square feet outside of the District of Columbia. The total annual lease cost outside the District of Columbia is eighteen and three-fourths million dollars. But what intrigues me is the number of buildings we have built and still we are unable to catch up with the governmental functions.

Some time when you get down on Fourteenth Street, going in the direction of the bridge across the Potomac, you will find completed there very recently an annex to the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, in which building they print nice, new, green money and beautifully colored postage stamps. That building, completed recently, provides 244,292 square feet of space.

When you have occasion to call on the Secretary of Agriculture or one of the department heads in the Department of Agriculture, and you get lost running around 22 acres of stone and masonry, take particular notice of the South Building, which was completed not so long ago, containing 1,054,724 square feet of space. Also observe the Department of Agriculture's Economics Building, built since 1933, embracing over 26,000 square feet.

When you wander down Constitution Avenue you will find the place where the Attorney General has his office, together with all the divisions in that Cabinet Department. Take particular note of that swanky building that has 477,000 square feet of space. Then the very genial lady, who has been the object of some criticism here and elsewhere lately and who presides over the destinies of the Labor Department, is installed in a very beautiful structure there which contains 229,000 square feet of space.

Not so long ago they had the dedication of the Apex Building, occupied by the Federal Trade Commission. I admit they were in dismal quarters formerly, wholly unsuited to the needs of the Commission, but it is simply another accretion to the Government's building program. When that building was completed it made available 131,000 square feet of space.

Then there is the Government Printing Office warehouse, with 160,000 square feet; the new Interior Building, a tremendous monument of stone, steel, and masonry, with 541,000 square feet of space, finished last year. Then there is the Internal Revenue Building, on Constitution Avenue, with 112,000 square feet; the Interstate Commerce and the Labor connecting wing, with its auditorium, cafe, and hearing rooms, embracing 81,000 square feet; the Interstate Commerce Building proper, containing 228,000 square feet; the new Post Office Building, with 418,000 square feet; and the new Procurement Building, with 141,000 square feet.

The total area we have added through Government construction in the Nation's Capital is 4,148,000 square feet. Add to that three and one-half million square feet of rented space and add further almost 26,000,000 square feet of rented space outside the District of Columbia and you will get a pretty fair idea how this Government has grown in its activities and functions since 1933.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman let me make one more observation? Then I shall yield with the utmost grace to my good friend.

Consider all this rented space in Washington, D. C. A rough calculation indicates that if it were all rolled into one it might be a single-story building 6,000 feet long and 600 feet wide. Such a building would extend from the Union Station to the Willard Hotel and probably be four times as wide as the over-all width of Constitution Avenue.

It seems to me that here, then, is a focal point at which we can begin some reflections on the expansion of governmental functions. If we continue to expand in the same degree in the next 6 or 7 years, obviously we will have to carry on a more adequate building program and lease other space everywhere in the country. I do not know when and where we shall reach the end. I do want to make one observation, however, and I believe my good friend the gentleman from Colorado will bear me out in this, that we are centralizing and centralizing and centralizing in the Nation's Capital to the point where the Government workers must go to work in three shifts in the morning and go back home in three shifts at night in order to avoid and avert constant traffic congestion. I know of no particular reason why we have to be always concentrating these functions in the Nation's Capital.

The census is an activity of government that requires no particular identity with other establishments in Washington. They are going to gather up their own data. They are going to calculate it on machines, some of which have been devised by persons in their own Department and others of which must be rented. Is there any reason you can think of why a building for that Bureau must be placed in Washington and another 7,500 people ultimately at peak operations of the Census Bureau be added to the congestion that has obtained here all these years? Why can it not be located in Chicago? Why can it not be located in Detroit? Why can it not be located in St. Louis? I see no reason in particular why it must be placed here. So it occurs to me that the members of the Committee might well consider this whole scheme of decentralization, which, in my judgment, would be very happy for the Nation's Capital and would render equity and justice to the rest of the taxpayers of the Nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Soon we shall hear a voluminous discussion of the national-defense program and the need for providing protection to certain parts of the country that are considered vulnerable especially in time of war. I wonder whether we are not year after year making the Nation's Capital more and more vulnerable by concentrating virtually every activity of government here. If there is anything to the representations and protestations that somebody might send an airplane carrier within 500 miles of our shores and then send bombing planes on, why, the first place to which any military tactician would direct his efforts would be the Nation's Capital. With every activity of the Government concentrated here, such an attack would in great measure destroy the coordinated functions of government in a very little while. Unless it can be demonstrated that the Census Bureau is so dependent on other agencies for information and service as to cripple its functions by removal to another site, there is much to be said in favor of taking these functions elsewhere.

I speak also for the taxpayers of the country. In the case of this building for the Census Bureau, whatever information they need from other governmental departments can be obtained by telephone or by telegraph, or by air mail or some other means of communication. I am wondering whether it is going to be the policy and the best possible program to add another huge building to the collection of masonry that already exists in Washington, D. C.

Now I yield to my very charming and gracious friend from Colorado.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I have listened very attentively to the enumeration of the large buildings which have recently

been erected in Washington by the Government. I notice the gentleman took particular pains to state these buildings had been constructed since 1933.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman I was just expressing a fact without emphasis.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I recognized only one building in the list, and that was the new Interior Department Building, which actually originated under this administration. The gentleman might have mentioned the \$15,000,000 Babylonian palace over here across the park housing the Supreme Court, and he might have mentioned the great building recently constructed as an annex to the Library of Congress. All of these buildings were authorized under previous Republican administrations, and the program started then.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My able friend, the gentleman from Colorado, can always pick out the weakness in an argument. However, I wish to say to the gentleman, who, along with so many others some years ago when I first came here, was inveighing against this great monument they referred to as Hoover's folly, now known as the Commerce Building, that we had only a handful of people in that building when it was completed, but you came along just in time to occupy it from cellar to garret and had to build extra walls and partitions in the building until the total number of people working there in one building finally reached 12,000, under the able leadership of General Johnson and his N. R. A. While the building was there and was occupied by us we did not pile up all the activities on the program and force thousands of people upon the Federal pay roll.

There were only some 40,000 or 50,000 people working in Washington then. Look at the Civil Service Commission list today. There are nearly 120,000 on Uncle Sam's pay roll in the District of Columbia. So, while we authorized it, and for a very good purpose, we did not make it a beehive of industry that was one day going to fall upon the shoulders of the taxpayers as a great, onerous burden.

That, I think, is a suitable and sufficient answer to my friend the gentleman from Colorado.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. However, it does occur to me that we are going on with a program of centralization that is not good for this city, and one that is not fair or equitable to the rest of the taxpayers of the country, and I see no good reason why the rest of the country should not have the benefit of some of the jobs that are always concentrated around the construction of a building and why the masons and the architects and the skilled workers and others in other portions of the country should not share in the beneficences of the Federal Treasury and of the present administration. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has set a reasonably good example in making a 26-percent cut on this bill. The only trouble is it did not cut deep enough.

There was such a nice opportunity to wipe off another three and a half million dollars which the committee did not embrace. This bill carries \$3,500,000 to put up a building for the Bureau of the Census, and let me say to you that that building would only be required for about 1 year and 3 months, for then the work would have evaporated and there would be nothing with which to fill up the building. It is absolutely unnecessary that we do this.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] pointed out earlier today, the thing we need to do is to get rid of some of those highfalutin, worthless agencies that are occupying rented space. We might better pay rent for 15 months than to spend three and a half million dollars for a building that is only necessary for 15 months.

Now what are some of these agencies that we could just as well evaporate or just as well get rid of and save a few dollars for the taxpayers as we go along; some of these agencies that are feeding off of the vitals of the Republic

and sapping the strength of our taxpayers and destroying their independence?

Let me say to you that the average rental that is paid is 95 cents a square foot, but let me read to you some of these highfalutin agencies and the amount they pay for their space:

National Defense Power Committee, 7,990 square feet, \$19,974.96, or \$2.50 a square foot.

Central Statistical Board, 6,700 square feet, \$10,084.44 or \$1.50 per square foot.

Federal Housing Administration, 18,000 square feet at \$17,000, and 100,000 square feet at \$155,000, and 48,000 square feet at \$74,000.

National Emergency Council, that council that came in here a year ago with a statement to the public that they had to have more money in an election year, 16,500 square feet at \$28,800, or \$1.70 a square foot.

National Labor Relations Board, 29,790 square feet at \$74,475, or \$2.50 a square foot.

T. V. A., 2,800 square feet at \$6,300, or upward of \$2 a square foot.

About three-fourths of these institutions which I have read and referred to and which actually pay the bulk of the high-priced rent that is paid by this Government out of the 3,600,000 square feet of rented space, should be abolished immediately and we should get rid of that cancer on the Government of the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Unfortunately, that happy situation cannot be brought about until 1941, I may say to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Well, that may be; but I have been hopeful that this Congress would have common sense enough to abolish a number of these worthless and useless agencies and get rid of some of this cancer that is sapping the vitals of America.

On top of this, even according to the program of the administration, there is a curtailment proposed in the W. P. A. proposition which should release space sufficient to take care of 2,500 of the employees of the Census Bureau that will need to be housed long before the requirement for the space can be met.

It seems to me that it is the height of folly to construct more buildings at this time to satisfy the greed of the bureaucrats to fill that space. I do not believe that the situation in Washington at this time justifies such a thing as going ahead with a building of that character. If you will look over the hearings from pages 8 to 14, inclusive, you will find almost invariably that those institutions that are carrying the high rental charge are the ones that could be gotten rid of, that there would be plenty of space available out of that occupied by the 22,000 who are in rented space here in the District of Columbia. There is plenty of opportunity to get rid of 4,500 and make room for all we need in the Census Bureau. For that reason, when this item in the bill is reached, when we read the bill under the 5-minute rules, I propose that we shall have an opportunity to vote on whether we want to saddle the taxpayers with more buildings.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is speaking of square footage. Has this been broken down at any time so as to give us an idea of what it cost per employee for rent? In other words, does it run as high as \$600 per annum per employee in some cases?

Mr. TABER. The T. V. A. runs \$300. The National Emergency Council runs \$250. The National Labor Relations Board runs \$250.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What about the P. W. A., to be found on page 12? Does not that run about \$600 per clerk per annum for rental space?

Mr. TABER. Yes; it does.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, as high as \$600 per capita.

Mr. TABER. Six hundred dollars per employee, but, of course, that is a highfalutin organization. I did not happen to see that. They are not like ordinary Government clerks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask again with reference to one of the new bureaus covered in the hearings? I have just briefly glanced at it. It is the Wage and Hour Division. I understand that Department is just getting into form and digging its channel, so to speak. It is looking forward to having a minimum of 1,500 employees.

Mr. TABER. It is looking forward to a disbursement of better than \$3,000,000 a year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For clerical staff?

Mr. TABER. Yes; for clerical and administrative staff. Some of them do not even do clerical work—some of these professors and economists and that sort of thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do we understand that these 1,500 listed are not the maximum that they expect to have when they get into full bloom?

Mr. TABER. All I know is that the Budget estimate calls for better than \$3,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Where will that Bureau be housed?

Mr. TABER. A part of it will be in the Labor Department Building, and a part of it spread around. I understand there is only one item of rental here for it. There is 729 Fifteenth Street, 2,700 square feet, but only 35 employees. Of course, they are going to have before the 1st of July 400 employed in the field as snoopers and inspectors, try to annoy these fellows who have only two or three employees who do not come under the act that the Wage and Hour Commissioner has in my opinion illegally ruled should be brought under it, and they are going to annoy those businessmen who have two or three employees and have not any business being brought in under the act by following them up. The big fellows are a minor problem.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand that Administrator Andrews can make a ruling which has the effect of law that such employees are within the provisions of the bill?

Mr. TABER. He cannot, but he thinks he can.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the industrial operator in the field goes along then under the assumption that he is covered by the bill after this ruling is made.

Mr. TABER. That is it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But it does not have the effect of law?

Mr. TABER. It does not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has the gentleman anything in the hearings about complaints against Administrator Andrews and Mr. Magruder along the lines of those which have been filed against the National Labor Relations Board insofar as the administration of the Wage and Hour Act is concerned?

Mr. TABER. No; I have not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has not heard of any reports like that?

Mr. TABER. Nothing of that kind. I do not think from anything that I have heard that he has overreached himself in that fashion at all.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself another 5 minutes to say a word or two about the rest of the bill. With reference to this item for grasshoppers, I thought that we were pretty fairly liberal. There is \$2,000,000 appropriated and there is \$700,000 left over and that should fairly meet the situation. It is \$700,000 more than what was spent last year and with no reason to believe that there would be a situation that they would be facing that would be worse.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have a very high regard, I may say, for the gentleman's economic views and his purpose in trying to economize as much as possible, but I find in these hearings where Dr. Strong testified that for every dollar

expended last year on grasshopper control alone, \$79 was saved. Now, does not the gentleman think if we have an infestation of grasshoppers and Mormon crickets as we did last year, the sum ought to be sufficient to deal with the subject now instead of having to come back to Congress later on to deal with the menace?

Mr. TABER. The money will be available now. This bill, in my opinion, will be passed and become a law within 2 weeks. The money will be available when it can be used most efficiently. From everything I could get from the entire set-up, including the fact that they failed to use \$700,000 of the money that was available last year, this will be sufficient. They said they did not get the money until too late to use it. On the other hand, they told us that they did not come too late when we were appropriating the money, so we have to bear that in mind when we consider that question. We are giving them \$700,000 more than they had last year. That will enable them to go out on some of this land that is not cultivated, and for which the farmer receives certain benefits and emoluments for keeping it out of cultivation, and correct the situation to a certain extent.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The very fact that this Department did not expend this \$700,000 shows that they can be entrusted with the money. Is it not advisable to give them a sufficient amount of money to deal with the usual infestation of grasshoppers and crickets to the end that they will have it if they need it, and the fact that they did not spend it before shows that they will not expend it unless it is necessary?

Mr. TABER. You know they have been coming here with a build-up on that situation for a great many years getting increased appropriations. There is not any evidence that they have it in hand any better today than when they first started. I think we ought not to give them more money than it is manifest they could use intelligently. I think we have given them enough.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I did not understand what the gentleman from Montana said, but is this grasshopper money spent for the purpose of exterminating pests after they appear or is it spent for the prevention of the appearance? I think it makes a great deal of difference whether we appropriate the money for one purpose or the other.

Mr. TABER. I think it is entirely spent for poison that kills the grasshoppers.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And also the eggs.

Mr. TABER. But I do not think it does go into the question of getting rid of the eggs.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, the money is available and will only be expended if the crickets or grasshoppers appear?

Mr. TABER. I do not know about the crickets. I cannot tell you about that.

Mr. MICHENER. Well, the gentleman referred to crickets.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Montana did, but I cannot answer that question. I do not know whether their method of killing the crickets gets rid of the eggs or not, but the grasshoppers are only killed with this poison bait that they have after they come to life.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKS. Is it not a fact that the extermination is a matter dependent almost entirely on the weather? That is, these things develop very rapidly.

Mr. TABER. Cold, damp weather tends to kill them off.

Mr. HAWKS. And they develop very rapidly under certain conditions?

Mr. TABER. Yes, that is true; in warm, dry weather.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have seen that territory and I have seen the damage they can do. I am very much in favor of the appropriation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is the gentleman in favor of increasing it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman mean to increase the New England item or the grasshopper item?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Both.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman is a good watchdog of the Treasury.

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not know about that.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As I understand from the report, on page 2, which gives a summary of the items in the bill, it mentions the Budget estimate of \$3,300,000 for the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine: Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases, 1939, \$3,300,000, but the bill, as I understand, only contains \$2,000,000, which is a decrease of \$1,300,000 under the Budget recommendation.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

That is true. At the same time, there are \$700,000 more available to them than they spent last year. The committee felt, after considering the thing very carefully, that that, with \$2,000,000 more, was sufficient for them to do everything they could do intelligently.

Now, I want to take a minute or two about the New England situation. The committee has brought in \$3,000,000 to help with the fire-hazard situation resulting from the hurricane.

There it is proposed to use this money with an equal amount to be matched by the States to get rid of the brush, clean up the roads and trails through the forests, and back a ways from the roads and the trails so that the fire hazard will not be so great. It is also intended to make breaks through the forest 200 or 300 feet wide so that if a fire should start it could not spread all over. With the situation that was presented to us and the evidence that we had available, I think this is about as far as the committee could be asked to recommend. We have not yet had evidence of what the local communities and States are going to do. Massachusetts itself has appropriated \$19,000,000. I understand that \$1,000,000 of that is to be used for this particular purpose. In Connecticut, Vermont, and New Hampshire, all of which are affected by this situation quite extensively, their legislatures have just met and are considering the proposition. I have no doubt but what they will provide funds to do something that may help the situation in their States and meet their share of any obligation that should be met.

I hope that the Committee can go along and carry this item.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, to descend from discussing the marble and granite fortresses here in the city of Washington to discussing grasshoppers is quite a tumble from the sublime to the ridiculous. It is rather funny and mirthful as a subject of debate here, but to those who have witnessed this phenomenon there is absolutely nothing funny or laughable about these insect infestations. When you consider the vast areas over which they occur, when you consider that these insects can travel from 500 to 700 miles per day with a favorable wind, when you consider that they actually eat the heavy-corded canvas coverings off of gas-tank hose, eat the carpets off of the floor, eat fence posts, eat all the foliage on the trees until they kill the trees, and when you

consider that they move in solid waves over great areas and destroy everything in their path, even a flood does not compare in crop damage with a grasshopper invasion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. My time is too limited to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wanted to make an appropriate observation at that point.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Very well; make the observation, but do not ask a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was it in the gentleman's country that the grasshoppers ate the feathers off of the turkeys? [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. They not only ate the feathers off the turkeys, they ate the turkeys. [Laughter.] I just cannot fancy a hungry grasshopper contenting itself with feathers when there is a turkey under the feathers. [Laughter.]

Seriously, I remember reading some years ago a prediction that eventually insect life would destroy and exterminate every other form of life on the globe; and it really makes a fellow think of that when he sees one of these infestations. I have seen such things as this, that when the eggs hatched and the insects got so they could just crawl, because they had developed sufficiently to fly, looking over that vast area of moving insects it looked like the surface of water rippled by the wind. If you do not think that will make the flesh crawl on your back and make you want to vote for big grasshopper control appropriations, I am here to tell you.

But this is really what I got up to say: My experience in 1937 caused me to have very great confidence in the Bureau of Entomology, in its knowledge of this situation, and in the reliability of its prognostications. It is true it transpired that last year they were not able to use all the money appropriated. I think there was a balance of \$700,000 that may be available in 1939. That was due, however, to a very great change in weather that occurred out in that country at the critical hatching period in the spring. We had a great deal more snow and cold rain over that area along in March and April than we had had in a good many years, and this arrested the development of the insects.

In 1937 the Budget asked \$2,000,000 for insect control. This recommendation came up here in the latter part of January or early in February. The committee cut it to \$1,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget stated that the Bureau of Entomology had predicted an infestation in 24 States. The infestation developed in 24 States, and just about the time the \$1,000,000 was gone the grasshoppers, the crickets, and so forth were just getting good and beginning to spread. It developed that more money was needed, and an additional \$1,000,000 was appropriated, but it was appropriated too late.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that every resource of those States was thrown into action to save the situation. Why, in Colorado they called out the National Guard, they requisitioned all the trucks of the National Park Service, of the highway department, of the National Guard, and the C. C. C. camps. They threw the C. C. C. boys into action. That was the only order of business throughout that whole area for several weeks—simply fighting grasshoppers.

I am not going to mention any names, but something happened at that time which shows that it is an ill wind that blows no man good. When I saw that the \$1,000,000 was not going to go far enough I went down to every agency of the Government that could deal with the matter. I found they had scraped the barrel clean. I put in the resolution to appropriate the other \$1,000,000 which was recommended in the Budget. I was informed, however, by a very influential member of the committee that it was too late to get action on a resolution of that sort and to make any appropriation; that all I could do was to make my showing and lay the ground work for the next year.

One morning I got a call from his office. He said, "MARTIN, can you run over to my office? Come on over. I want to show you something." I went over there. He had a daily paper from his own district. He lived in another

State that was supposed to be entirely beyond the danger of invasion. Across the top of the front page of the daily paper was the statement that his State was threatened with the greatest grasshopper invasion in its history.

He said, "How long do you think it will take you to get your grasshopper people before the committee? Can you do it before 10 o'clock?" I said, "You bet I can." By 10 o'clock I had the best bunch of grasshopper storytellers you ever saw before that committee. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], where they really grow grasshoppers, came on last and stole the show so far as telling grasshopper stories is concerned. At 3 o'clock the resolution passed the House by unanimous consent.

We got action on that million dollars, but if it had not been for the invasion by grasshoppers of one congressional district we would not have gotten the money.

We have a lot of confidence in the knowledge of the Bureau of Entomology. The Bureau of Entomology is a scientific organization that knows its business. It does its job and it generally does it accurately. Mr. Chairman, I cannot imagine their asking for \$6,000,000 to take care of a situation wherein \$2,000,000 would be sufficient. I do not honestly believe that Bureau would do that. So far as I know, the Bureau of Entomology has never come up here before and asked for any such sum as that. I believe when they do ask for it they have the information on which to base a campaign calling for the expenditure of that amount of money or else they would not ask for such an appropriation. If more is provided for them than they need, they will do what they did last year. They will not expend it and it will be a carry-over to future years.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. I am very much in sympathy with what the gentleman says and I know for a fact, being a member of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations, that the Bureau of Plant Quarantine and Entomology is one of the very fine agencies of the Government. My district is not seriously affected by this matter, but the gentleman's district is and many others are. I wish the gentleman would state to the House what the accomplishments were as a result of the money spent last year in connection with the protection of the farmers' crops in those regions where the work was carried on.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I can only say it was very effective, but would have been more so had the \$2,000,000 been appropriated in the first place.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield? I think I can answer that question, as shown by the hearings, copy of which I hold in my hand. Dr. Strong testified, and it is undisputed in the record, that of every dollar expended by the Federal Government \$79 were saved. If that is not a good investment, I do not know what would be.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Montana for his figures. Mr. Chairman, when you have an infestation in 24 States, and, as stated in this report, they anticipate a grasshopper infestation in 22 States and an infestation of Mormon crickets in 11 States, that means half of the area of the United States, and when you consider it is in the western country, it is more than half the area of the United States. In an extraordinary year it would be very easy to infest the other half. It was an astonishing piece of information to me that these insects could move as far as 700 miles in 24 hours. They could rise from the district of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and could be parked in Illinois next morning.

I hope we will at least be given the \$3,300,000 recommended by the Budget, which, with the unexpended balance of \$700,000, will give us \$4,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether everyone here is familiar with what a grasshopper infestation means.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Go ahead and tell them.

Mr. BURDICK. I happen to come from the headquarters of the grasshopper damage. There are a lot of you who do not know the difference between a grasshopper and a Mormon cricket. The only difference I can see is that the horns of the Mormon cricket are a little bit larger than those of the grasshopper. I would characterize a Mormon cricket as an overgrown grasshopper. The only difference is in laying their eggs the Mormon cricket lays them wherever they stop, while the grasshoppers lay them in swarms. It is much easier to eradicate grasshoppers than it is Mormon crickets.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks here the areas in the United States which will be affected during the year 1939.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I may say that the Government has asked for something like \$6,000,000 to do this job. From that sum they have deducted \$700,000, that was not expended last year.

I want to call your attention to the fact there are about 51,000,000 acres in the United States that will be infested with grasshoppers this year. Of this 51,000,000 acres about 17,000,000 acres are raw land, unoccupied land, that is really the breeding bed for the entire grasshopper infestation. There are about two and one-half million acres of land that has been used but taken out of cultivation through foreclosure and the farm program.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Does the gentleman mean this year?

Mr. BURDICK. This year there will be 2,500,000 acres of that kind of land. That is where they breed the worst—where fields have been and have gone back. Last year they made no concerted effort to stop these grasshoppers in any section of the area except on the farms where there were crops.

The purpose this year is to do the job and do it right, and with nothing short of the \$6,000,000, with the \$700,000 deducted, can we hope to do the job. If you do not want to go the full way in making this appropriation as the Department has recommended it, I would say to you, do not appropriate any money at all, because it is useless. Let me give you an example of what occurred right in my own part of the country.

This year, in July, we had the largest crop standing we have had in the last 30 years. It would probably go from 25 to 40 bushels per acre of wheat. We had poisoned all the grasshoppers in that section of North Dakota, which is called the Missouri Slope section, the hardest part of the State to handle in respect to grasshoppers. However, we had poisoned and poisoned, and followed the directions of the Department until we had the grasshoppers cleaned out. Then, within a period of 24 hours, thousands and thousands of acres of that wheat were totally destroyed. The farmers never put a binder on a large part of it. The hoppers came in from the southwest, from the direction of Wyoming, in swarms that swarmed in the air to a height of a thousand feet. They came in with the wind. In 24 hours, as I say, millions of acres of wheat in North Dakota were destroyed.

If you do not want to go the whole way and do this job right and stop the grasshoppers in their breeding grounds, which are located by sending out an army of men to find these fields—and it is proposed to spread the poison by airplane after these areas across the country are flagged and the beds located—there is not very much use of doing anything. My experience has been that we can poison grasshoppers, but if we do not go on the vacant land, on the land that has been taken by foreclosure, which no one occupies, we might just as well let the whole thing go, because a farmer cannot lose any more than 100 percent of his crop in any event.

The Congress has never appropriated the amount of money the Department of Agriculture has recommended. It is claimed that we have \$700,000 left from the appropriation of last year, and that this shows we had too much

money then. That is not the case at all. No effort was made to poison the grasshoppers on these two types of land, vacant, unoccupied land, and the abandoned fields, which is where the grasshoppers came from this year. If we are to do the job anywhere near as it should be done I am prepared to say from practical experience that the estimates made by the Department of Agriculture are true and correct. If you propose now to spend another \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 on this job and let the grasshoppers increase in other sections of the country, my advice to the country is not to spend anything, just leave it the way it is. However, if you really intend to help us, there is something that can be done.

Let me say that the loss to the farmers of the United States from grasshoppers last year was between \$150,000,000 and \$200,000,000. While in some sections the expenditure of the money appropriated by Congress did help and did save some grain, and there was some general benefit, yet no attempt was made, and there never has been an attempt made in this country to stamp out this infestation absolutely, or bring the infestation under control. However, if you will appropriate what the Department has asked, some \$5,000,000, we will then be in position to control this infestation, which takes from the farmers of America an average loss of \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000 every year.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that when the grasshoppers got through eating you up in North Dakota they swept over into Montana and destroyed in three or four counties there wheat valued in the neighborhood of \$6,000,000?

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman is correct. The loss in eastern Montana, the section adjacent to my area of North Dakota, was slightly over \$6,000,000 in one crop.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With regard to the fields where the "hoppers" destroyed the grain and no crop was harvested did the farmers operating those farms receive any benefits at all under the Soil Conservation Act?

Mr. BURDICK. Not any more than they had arranged for in the first place under the agricultural program. They had cut down their acreage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What I mean is, did they receive any benefits due to the fact the crop was not harvested?

Mr. BURDICK. No. No insurance was in operation at that time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the method used in destroying the eggs in the uncultivated fields in advance of the hatching?

Mr. BURDICK. There is no method or no program for digging down in the ground and destroying the eggs.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is done? Do you poison the land?

Mr. BURDICK. We poison the "hoppers" when they are hatched, when they come out. You can destroy a lot of them by plowing, of course.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Answering the question more fully, nothing is being done except by the farmer himself who volunteers to go and get the material the Government is going to furnish him. We do not go on the field as long as someone is there.

I may say, however, the whole theory of exterminating the grasshoppers is out of the question. The only thing that will exterminate the grasshoppers is climatic conditions.

Mr. BURDICK. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. So no effort is being made to exterminate the grasshoppers, but only to get to the farmers the food that will poison the hoppers and get them to use it;

yet the gentleman is intimating in his remarks that we ought to aim at extermination.

Mr. BURDICK. No; I said control the damage done by the grasshoppers. There will always be grasshoppers. It would be a fool proposition for this Congress to try to exterminate the grasshoppers, because they always have been and always will be. We can control the damage they do, however.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it at the time the hatching takes place and the grasshoppers begin to appear that you apply this poison through the use of airplanes?

Mr. BURDICK. For the first 6 weeks after they are hatched. If you wait until after that time you might as well feed the poison to the wind.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the wheat crop insurance provision cover the loss incurred by reason of the destruction by grasshoppers?

Mr. BURDICK. It will in 1939 and 1940, but the premium is very high and it would take about all a man has to pay for such insurance. It is all right in the eastern sections of the country where the hazard is not so great, where drought is not prevalent and where there is no hail and very few grasshoppers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On that point, what did the farmers in your State who actually placed wheat on the market and sold it and collected for it last summer get per bushel for their wheat?

Mr. BURDICK. About 58 cents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Fifty-eight cents per bushel?

Mr. BURDICK. Fifty-eight cents for number 1 wheat, but we did not have very much of that and most of our wheat brought about 41 cents.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, under the permission granted me, I insert the following from the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations:

Allotments for control of emergency and incipient outbreaks of insect pests

Project	Public resolutions—			Second Deficiency Act (June 25, 1938)	Total
	No. 26 (1937-38)	No. 55 (1938)	No. 81 (1938-39)		
Grasshopper control.....	\$1,000,000	\$615,000	\$1,495,000	\$500,000	\$3,610,000
Mormon-cricket control.....		169,500	314,100		483,600
White-fringed-beetle control.....		215,440	154,946		370,386
Army-worm control.....	(1)		(2)		
Unallotted.....			35,954	200,000	235,954
Total.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	700,000	4,700,000

¹ Not to exceed \$100,000 was made available for this purpose from the allotment for grasshopper control; approximately \$4,400 expended.
² Not to exceed \$50,000 is available for this purpose from the allotment for grasshopper control; approximately \$11,100 expended.

The obligations by crop years are shown in this table:

Control of emergency and incipient outbreaks of insect pests—obligations by crop seasons

	1937	1938	Total
Grasshopper control.....	\$1,103,542	\$2,120,645	\$3,224,187
Mormon-cricket control.....	6,571	392,103	398,674
White-fringed beetle control.....	56,099	299,514	355,613
Army-worm control.....	4,400	11,137	15,537
Total.....	1,170,612	2,823,399	3,994,011

Analysis of estimate for grasshopper control, 1939

General information:	
Total number of States involved.....	22
Total acres of infested cropland.....	30,884,595
Total acres of infested range land (migratorial species).....	17,357,035
Total acres of abandoned infested farm land (migratorial species).....	2,771,671
Total acres infested.....	51,013,301

General information—Continued.

Tons of bait needed to protect crops in farm areas, 140,569 less 40,000 on hand.....	100,569
Tons of bait needed to control migratorial species on abandoned farm and range lands, 65,673 less 15,000 on hand.....	50,673
Total tons of bait needed.....	151,242

Cost of control on farm lands: Purchase and transportation to distribution centers of 100,569 tons of bait material at \$20 per ton (includes administrative and supervisory costs)..... \$2,011,380

This material is unloaded, stored, and mixed by local agencies and distributed on farm lands by farmers.

Cost of control of migratorial species on abandoned farm land and range land in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma:

Purchase and transportation to distribution centers of 50,673 tons of bait material at \$20 per ton (includes administrative and supervisory costs).....	1,013,460
Cost of mixing bait, in addition to local labor and facilities.....	221,092
Cost of hauling bait from mixing stations to field crews, including rental of trucks.....	361,296
Cost of pulling spreaders 1,954,860 miles in spreading bait.....	179,872
Cost of labor required for mixing and distributing bait.....	901,600

Total cost..... 4,688,700

This involves the use of 2,254 bait-spreading machines working 195,486 hours in spreading bait and the employment of 4,508 men.

Analysis of estimate for Mormon-cricket control, 1939

General information:

Total acres infested in 11 States (Nevada, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming).....	18,919,337
Heavily infested acres needing control to protect crops.....	417,324

Cost of control on 417,324 acres:

Labor for control operations on public and private lands and supplementing farm labor and labor furnished by local agencies.....	\$351,000
Materials, equipment, and supplies supplementing that furnished by local agencies.....	132,605
Technical, supervisory, and administrative expense.....	116,795

Total, Federal cost..... 600,400

Control will involve the use of approximately 300 miles of metal barrier, over 200 power dusters, and 1,000 hand dusters, work to be conducted by approximately 1,500 laborers.

Cost of control to Federal Government will be approximately \$1.45 per acre. The total cost will be approximately \$2.15 per acre; one-third of the total cost is expected to be borne by States and other cooperating agencies as was the case last year.

EXTENT OF AREA TO BE COVERED

Mr. O'NEAL. How much of an area would you cover?

Dr. STRONG. Grasshoppers would cover 24 States, Mormon crickets 11 States.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. What States are they? Can you put the names of the States in the record?

Dr. STRONG. Yes, sir. The grasshopper situation is shown on this map.

(The statement referred to follows:)

"The States where grasshoppers will occur in outbreak numbers in 1939 are: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

"The States where Mormon crickets will occur in outbreak numbers in 1939 are: Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming."

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, the general purpose of a deficiency bill is to provide supplemental appropriations for the operation of the departments that have already been provided for in previous appropriation bills. Such appropriations are intended as emergency measures to piece out the needs of a department or bureau after the regular appropriation has been made. Included in the bill we have before us today is an appropriation for the Department of Labor for the operation and administration of the wage and hour bill.

When the committee had the draft before it, sent up by the Department of Labor, there was tucked into that draft a provision that I think should be called to the attention of

the House, for it indicates an attitude that I believe the House does not approve and which I believe should be criticized.

Those of you who happen to have the hearings before you will note that on page 71 of the hearings the assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Labor, as well as the Administrator of the wage and hour agency, was before the committee for examination. At that time the attention of the administrator was directed to language in the draft of the bill which was sent to the committee providing that the agency could use a part of the fund provided for in this deficiency appropriation for packing, crating, and transporting household goods and effects of its employees.

During the course of the examination on the subject in question, the assistant to the Secretary of Labor finally excused the inclusion of this particular language in the draft sent to the committee with these words:

Would it not be well to raise that as a point of order?

The Administrator and the assistant to the Secretary of Labor both admitted that there was nothing in the existing law giving any authority whatever to the Department or to this agency for the expenditure of funds for this purpose. Pressed for a reason as to why it was included, the suggestion was made that other appropriation bills had carried such an item and therefore this newly created agency felt that it might, too, secure the same privilege, using, however, the subterfuge and the cunning of including it in a deficiency measure rather than waiting until the regular appropriation for that activity came before the Committee on Appropriations.

The amount involved here is not very great, but I do believe that the principle involved is a very material and a very fundamental one. I believe it goes to the matter of good faith of a department in dealing with the Congress. I believe this Congress cannot condone or excuse an assistant to one of the Cabinet officers who suggests that it is perfectly proper to include in the Department's draft of legislation such language as that public official knows to be improper and then gloss it over by saying that it can be eliminated on a point of order. I say the duty of the Department is to send a draft to the committee which the Department knows will not be subject to a point of order. A course of conduct which depends for its standards of honor upon the avoidance of detection of violations of the law indicates a low-water mark in moral competency. Every agency of our Government, and that means those who are responsible for setting the standards of these agencies, should seek to inspire confidence in those with whom they deal, confidence not only in their efficiency, but what is vastly more important, confidence in their integrity of purpose. Perfect candor should prevail. Subterfuge should have no place. And that applies in their dealings with the Congress.

We have been listening too long to the demands of the executive branch of the Government that anything sent here with executive approval must be accepted—must be approved. During the last 5 years executive agencies have been springing up like mushrooms, each of them ambitious and grasping for power. They secure such power by means such as the Department of Labor resorts to here. The motive is clearly indicated in this case, to get by without detection. In effect the assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Labor says, "You should pass or introduce or urge the adoption of legislation which is beyond the rules of the House, and which can be subject to a point of order." If those who are responsible for the submission of estimates to the Congress for appropriations are guilty of the same indifference in determining the financial needs of our Government bureaus as the indifference to the rules and regulations of the House advocated by the assistant to the Secretary of Labor, then no credibility whatever can attach to the justifications upon which all appropriations are based. Such a course casts a shadow of doubt upon the probity of the administration of the Department as a whole and destroys that confidence

without which cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government cannot be maintained. Good faith is a fundamental requisite.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 a new agency was created. This is the agency with which we are dealing. It is under the Department of Labor.

It deals with the relations existing between employer and employee. Utmost good faith in its operation will be necessary if it is to carry out the purposes of the act.

I wonder how the employer or employee or the consumer can be assured that a just and honorable and equitable adjustment of differences will be reached by an agency that suggests that it is right to do something which it knows to be wrong, providing it is not detected. Wait for a point of order is the advice of the assistant, even though we know it is against the rules of the House. What degree of confidence can a wage earner or an employer have in the inspectors and investigators of this agency if this is the code of fair dealing advocated by the Department?

We have heard the President say that he is proud of the reestablishment of spiritual values. Spiritual values do have real worth. Let those values include the old homely virtues of honesty, fair dealing, and integrity of purpose. Let the legislative and executive branches feel that they are dealing with each other open and above board and that the cards are not being stacked under the table. That will go far to reestablish a moral standard which will reflect real spiritual values.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the House will join with me not only in criticism but in censure of any agency of the Government that comes here under the cover of a deficiency appropriation bill, an emergency appropriation, and then tries to cunningly, craftily, adroitly, and with subterfuge slip something into the bill which it knows to be against the rules of the House. Such an attitude cannot be condoned. It deserves criticism and censure. Let us have a little less cunning, a little more candor, a little less craftiness, a little more conscience. Let the executive agencies give us the same measure of good faith as they expect at our hands.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. I cannot permit the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] to go unchallenged. He is usually so logical in his thinking and discriminating in his judgment that I actually sat amazed during his diatribe against the wage and hour administration. I never met Mr. Andrews until he appeared before our committee.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. If the gentleman followed me personally, he will know that I directed no attack on Mr. Andrews. The quotation to which I directed the attention of the House was an answer of the assistant to the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Saunders. I join the gentleman in having real regard, from what I have been told and what I have observed, for the Administrator of the wage and hour group.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I appreciate what the gentleman says, but even that statement of the gentleman puts a different light upon it. The gentleman held up to the committee the departments had "cunningly, craftily," stealthily, tried to slip something into a bill that has no place in the bill. My friend is too sophisticated in parliamentary procedure and in appropriations to feel that way about it. Mr. Richard Saunders, the gentleman referred to, is the Budget officer of the Department of Labor. My friend knows, he should know, he does know, that the language sent to the committee was sent by the Budget Bureau and not by the Department, that the language which comes to the deficiency subcommittee either is prepared by or approved by the Director of the Budget. The Department asked the Budget for \$400,000 more than the Budget recommended. The Budget slashed the figures heavily. The Department asked the Budget to permit them, when they moved their agents from one place of duty to another, to pay a certain amount of the costs incurred by

those employees of the Government in moving from one official post of duty to another—a procedure that is quite common in the Government service, a provision that is carried in many of the appropriation bills, a provision that could have been knocked out many times if anybody had challenged it.

The Army and Navy have that provision; the State Department; all of the bureaus of the Government who have important field officers, who periodically have to be changed from one point to another in their official duties are permitted, by legislation, to pay a portion of the cost of transporting those officers and their goods from one post of duty to another.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. DITTER. I recognize the long experience of the gentleman and how well informed he is. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not he knows of any instance in which this effort was made in a deficiency bill for a newly created agency?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Perhaps not. I am not able to see the significance that the gentleman draws by this matter coming up in a deficiency bill. Deficiency is a name that covers a multitude of things. There is no deficiency connected with the New England hurricane situation.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman will admit, and does, of course, acknowledge that all of the matters in connection with the operation of a department are more clearly inquired into in the regular bill for the operation of that department than when a deficiency bill for that department is before the committee? That is reasonable to assume, is it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No. I cannot admit that. I do not think there is a stronger group in the House than the deficiency subcommittee, headed on the gentleman's side by the industrious and alert gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], augmented now by the discerning services of my friend from Pennsylvania. I think there will be careful inquiry.

Mr. DITTER. I think the gentleman is attempting a construction that he knows I in no sense intended. Headed by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, than whom there is no more able man in the House, the deficiency is well manned on the Democratic side, and particularly well managed in the chairmanship, but is there not greater opportunity and more time put in when the regular bill for the Department is before the subcommittee, than during the time that the deficiency matters come before the committee?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, I cannot agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman and I disagree very amiably. May I inquire, is the House to understand that if any criticism attaches to this matter to which I directed the attention of the House, the gentleman feels that criticism should be directed to the Budget officer, rather than the Department of Labor?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not think any criticism, in the sense that the gentleman made criticism, is appropriate to anybody. The provision in question was struck out of the bill unanimously when the gentleman called attention to it. I do not think the matter is one which, by the wildest stretch of imagination, could be turned into anything that the gentleman has pictured as an effort of a department or an officer to undertake to put something over on the Congress or the Government.

Mr. DITTER. Are we to understand the gentleman feels that the economies he has so advocated to the House will be advanced if all of the departments, all of the agencies, and all of the bureaus that have sprung up in the last 5 years are permitted to have this privilege of paying the moving expenses of the hordes of New Deal employees?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, I quite agree with the gentleman, and did so in the committee, that it was not a proper provision to go in the bill; but for the life of me I cannot see how the gentleman has worked himself into a

lather over it. He indicts the Department of Labor, indicts the wage and hour administration, and throws suspicion on the whole administrative organization. Perhaps the gentleman did not intend to, but when the gentleman reads his remarks I think that is what he will find.

Mr. DITTER. I in no sense retract. I still feel the impropriety of including in a deficiency bill the language in question, and in the absence of a better explanation than that afforded by either Mr. Saunders or any of those identified with him, with only the explanation that it should be protected by the alertness of the House in taking it out on a point of order, I still stand fast on the censure that I intend to bring to those chargeable with it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, the gentleman is entitled to his position.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] as far as inserting matters of this kind in appropriation bills is concerned, but I am wondering whether a department that happens to slip these items in, knowing that they are subject to a point of order, is in any different position than the Appropriations Committee which, in every appropriation bill we have before the House, brings before us items of legislation, knowing they are subject to points of order, and yet attempting to let them slip through if that can be done without attracting the attention of the Members. What is the difference?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Speaking of a point of order, the gentleman, of course, knows, because he is an alert parliamentarian, that there is an item in this bill in which many of his colleagues on his side of the aisle are interested, that is subject to a point of order—the New England hurricane item. There is no authorization for it in the law.

Are we to impugn the motives of the New England delegation? Are we to impugn the motives of the Bureau of the Budget? Is everybody connected with Congress to doubt these departments and feel that they are trying to put something over on Congress which is subject to a point of order?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman hardly feels that there is justification in drawing an analogy between this hurricane situation and the relationship existing between a department or bureau and the Congress in providing for the regular operations of the department or bureau. The analogy certainly does not hold good.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Perhaps it does not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I think, however, it is perhaps as logical as the position my friend takes that a bureau or department asks the Budget to include certain language, the Budget Bureau does so, the committee finds it and unanimously strikes it out. My friend is greatly agitated about that. It seems to me it puts a very wrong interpretation on a bureau that certainly from my viewpoint made a very creditable showing before the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I notice that the language of that portion of the bill dealing with hurricane damage carries this additional proviso:

That section 3709, Revised Statutes, shall not apply in the case of any expenditure hereunder where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$300.

The usual provision of law in that regard is for purchases not exceeding a certain amount.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was there some purpose in changing that language so that donations on account of storm damage could be made?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; the statute cited by the gentleman does not apply to donations. It requires proposed

purchases and contracts for supplies or services to be advertised. We have adopted the practice of exempting small purchases from this requirement of the law.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Does the gentleman desire to use further time?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN].

MIGRATION OF DESTITUTE CITIZENS ACROSS STATE LINES

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, this week the Department of Education of the State of California is requesting our State legislature to appropriate \$750,000 for the education of children of destitute citizens of other States. There are 30,000 of these children, and the financial burden they thrust upon the school districts and the State of California's fine educational system is appalling.

This condition, Mr. Chairman, deplorable as it is, is merely a consequence of the shameful and inadequate treatment now provided in this Nation for the 1,000,000 destitute citizens who are "Stateless", are forced by unbearable standards of living, poverty, health, and debt to cross State lines in an attempt to avoid starvation, and gain the bare necessities of life.

WHAT THE CONGRESS HAS DONE WITH THE PROBLEM

Three years ago the Senate reported a resolution calling for an investigation of the plight of the migratory worker, and by amendment gave the Labor Department the job of investigation without appropriation. A splendid preliminary report was made to the Senate and the Secretary of Labor stated at that time that an appropriation of \$20,000 would be needed to print the report, complete the investigation, and assemble sufficient data to recommend remedial legislation.

The preliminary report of the Secretary of Labor was never printed as a Senate document. It is in my office now, nearly 2 years old, and still not sufficiently complete to be used for the drafting of remedial legislation.

I regret that the Joint Committee on Printing refused to order the publication of this report.

I regret the fact that after the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 85, and it was reported in the House, that we failed to join the Senate at the last Congress in the passage of this resolution granting the Labor Department \$20,000 to complete its work.

HOUSE INVESTIGATION REQUESTED

Today, Mr. Chairman, I am introducing a resolution, which I sincerely trust the Rules Committee will report without delay. It provides that the Speaker appoint a special investigating committee of five members to "inquire into the interstate migration of destitute citizens, to study, survey, and investigate the social and economic needs, and the movement of indigent persons across State lines, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the House in enacting remedial legislation."

The purpose of this investigation is simply this: (1) To permit the Secretary of Labor to complete her report, and the various national authorities who put so much time into the preliminary study, to complete their investigation and suggest legislative remedies; (2) to permit public charitable agencies and social-science authorities to add their recommendations to those of the Labor Department; and (3) to print for the use of the committee a selected and authoritative document which will give the Nation and the Congress reliable information on the extent of this problem, and its social implications.

SEEKS INTELLIGENT APPROACH

To carry out the purposes of the resolution I offer today would only involve a minor expense and, in the face of a problem which is every day becoming more acute, an expenditure which is absolutely necessary if the Congress is going to take action.

The transient unemployed are the constituents of no individual Congressman; they are the constituents of the Nation at large. If you cut relief appropriations for their care, no State welfare agency or county charitable organization is

interested in the nonresident application. So I say that it is time that the Congress set about approaching this problem intelligently, instead of bouncing our "Stateless," homeless, and poverty-stricken citizens from one committee to another, while throughout the Nation they are bounced from one State to another.

SERIOUS PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE STUDY

Mr. Chairman, I should like to list briefly for the House the principal problems which necessitate study by the proposed committee:

1. Interstate nature of the migratory problem

California, as we all know, is the hardest hit by the western migration of families who have suffered from drought or other economic setbacks in the Midwest. We have 900,000 persons who receive some form of relief in our State, and the non-resident-relief load for the last 3 years has increased by 100,000 indigent Dust Bowl refugees each year for 3 years.

The Nation as a whole has been affected. Before the program of work relief was adopted, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration gave \$90,000,000 in direct Federal aid to these people. Now the policy of the Government has been to divert the handling of these cases to the W. P. A. and the Farm Security Administration on a rigidly curtailed program.

However, the following States are suffering from a serious influx of these destitute families: New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Maryland, District of Columbia, Florida, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Texas, Arizona, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and California. And the rest of the States have no machinery or appropriations to provide for these families when they are stranded.

2. The problem of health

Forty-two percent of the cases in the Kern County Hospital in California for last year involved the treatment of nonresident patients. This is another serious financial burden upon the county. Local agencies alone cannot control the spreading of tuberculosis and venereal diseases by these infected migrants. Children suffer from malnutrition and exposure, and the normal community facilities are not available for these outcasts in any State, except in extreme emergency.

3. The problem of labor

Wage scales of 20 cents per hour and less in the Southwest are very common. In California, where we pay agricultural workers on the average of 50 cents an hour, this influx of workers is driving our wage scales down. A starving man will work for food, and the labor department survey shows that he will work for any salary, no matter how small. In California today there are four workers in the field for every position, and the number of jobs for this seasonal income is being slashed because of the national crop curtailment program.

4. The problem of education

These children are entitled to education, and that is the opinion of the California educational authorities. They need both academic instruction and vocational education. Many States will not attempt to see that these children, who are nonresidents, go to school. We give direct student aid through the National Youth Administration, but I feel that a portion of such funds should be set aside for the homeless transient waif that, because of real handicaps of life, is in greater need of education than those children in good homes.

5. The legal problem

Laws relating to residence in the various States are popularly designated "settlement laws." They work great hardship on persons forced to move. There is no uniformity, and in some States merely crossing the border means loss of citizenship, while in others a year's absence cuts off all claim to residence. In California a person under law cannot receive county relief unless a resident of that county 3 years; nor State relief unless a resident 1 year; nor W. P. A. unless the State certifies that the person is a resident. Thus these Stateless persons are fed and clothed illegally by our counties and by the State, and the W. P. A., while the Farm Security Administration assists them to remain in the State

long enough to demand State and county relief as citizens. When they get on the W. P. A. they send for the rest of their relatives in the Midwestern States and help them keep alive in California with Federal funds until they too may demand relief.

WHAT TRANSIENTS NEED

Mr. Chairman, these 1,000,000 Stateless citizens of our country need help today in the following forms: First, relief provisions, clothing, and shelter; second, medical aid and instruction in hygiene; third, accurate information as to possibility of employment in other States where migratory workers are needed for seasonal crops; fourth, educational facilities for the children, particularly vocational training; and fifth, uniform treatment in all States with a Federal agency responsible for their treatment and the earmarking of special funds from relief appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, at a later date I will address the House further on this subject, but I request at this time that Members of the House that are interested in this problem join with those of us who regard this as a problem more important to the Nation as a whole than to my State, or any particular State now caring, in many cases illegally, for the citizens of other States. [Applause.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, since the district I have the honor to represent is located in the San Joaquin Valley of California, the area to which so many unfortunate transients have migrated in recent years, I am more than ordinarily interested in the proposal offered by my colleague, Mr. TOLAN.

During the past several years California's treasury has been drained, its relief administrators harassed by demands impossible of fulfillment, and its private citizens constantly called upon to supplement an all too inadequate Government relief. Even California's famed hospitality is now strained to the breaking point.

According to Mr. Thomas W. McManus, secretary of the California Citizens' Association, over 300,000 indigent migrants have come to California in the last 2 years. As a consequence of a survey conducted by this organization, it was discovered that, contrary to popular belief, these transients are not migratory farm laborers fitted for specialized farm work in California. Rather, they are farm and share-crop families displaced, through no fault of their own, by drought, depression, and crop curtailment—good people who have come to California in the slim hope of obtaining some sort of subsistence to tide them over from day to day.

This migration has brought the State's daily relief load to 900,000. There are four agricultural workers for every single available job; and should a further crop-curtailment program be levied upon California agriculture, this ratio will reach disastrous proportions.

Time does not permit a detailed account of the misery occasioned by this optimistic migration. Because of fierce labor competition, the wage structure has been threatened with collapse. Large families have been forced to use cardboard shacks as places of permanent abode. Squatter camps have sprung up in numberless locations, a constant threat to the public health.

True, State, Federal, and private relief organizations have attempted to cope with the problem, but the ever-increasing burden is now too much for State and local authority to bear.

Even if this perplexing problem could be solved by relief agencies, the result would be merely a temporary palliative. A long-range plan looking to a permanent solution is necessary, and I confidently believe that if the House should adopt the resolution proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN], a long step will have been taken in the right direction. [Applause.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few observations at this time in connection with the wage and hour division which is under discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against the bill, but I feel that in justice to Administrator Andrews and Mr. Magruder that those who opposed the bill should say a word in their behalf for the genuine, common horse sense which I feel they are using in administering the act. I am certain that if the vote were to be taken again I would vote against the bill as I did before; but, as I observe and check on the situation, I feel that the services, or the administration of these gentlemen whom I have mentioned, is so far above and beyond that of the National Labor Relations Board that Members of Congress should recognize the high type of administration which is being given by these two gentlemen.

The difficulty that I want to call to the attention of the House at this moment is something that may prove to be a disastrous defect in the act in that contingent liabilities are being piled up every day on the industries of this country; that is, against their capital structures which may at some future time precipitate a situation as embarrassing to public accountants, bankers, stockholders, and all others involved as has the Musica-Coster, McKesson-Robbins proposition.

It is practically impossible for an accountant to examine the books of an institution which has hundreds of employees and then certify as to the responsibility, or financial obligation, which that company has to the employees under the Wage and Hour Division with reference to the time-and-a-half, or overtime, liability which is piling up. If a concern makes the payment without knowing that the law holds that the liability exists, and it finds later that the liability does not exist, the stockholders have been deprived of equities in the concern, because the payment was made although the law did not require it. If the firm runs on for weeks, months, and years and then does find that the liability exists, some accounting firm may be severely criticized for having certified to the financial balance sheets to banks and other lending institutions that the company had no liability under the act and later find that the assets must be decreased by the amount of the liability which runs by reason of some court decision. I think this Congress at the appropriate time should amend the law and set a date beyond which such liability shall not run against the company.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. We all appreciate that the gentleman has had expert training as an accountant and that he knows what he is talking about in this particular. What length of time does the gentleman think would be the proper limit to place?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am just going to make the observation that when you set the date you put into effect a stop-gap against the interest of the employee. In other words, why should I as an employee be deprived of my time and a half for overtime if the law grants it to me?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But if the rights of the employee are recognized as this act, I think, did recognize on this particular point, then you cannot recognize the right of the industrial concern, or the capital structure, we will say. So I am not prepared to answer the gentleman's question except in an arbitrary manner; that is to say, to make the period, say, 1 or 2. Even if you run 2 years, in the case of a company with a weak capital structure and a large number of employees, or even with just a weak capital structure, when the law takes effect and the liability is established and the company must pay, there is serious danger that you destroy the capital structure of the company.

For other reasons, as well as this one, I voted against the act. I believe that in due course unless we change it very materially, we will find that the act will result in the financial collapse of a great many institutions when the force of the law becomes operative.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HAWKS].

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Chairman, this being my maiden trip down to the Well of this House, I should like to confine my comments to a subject about which I know something. I should like to speak about the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., because in the great catastrophe that has occurred in New England the value and the importance of our great laboratory manifests itself, and when I say "our great laboratory" I include all of the Members of the Congress and all of the States of the Union, because the services of this laboratory are not in any way limited or restricted to Wisconsin and the States immediately adjacent thereto.

I believe the laboratory operating at Madison, Wis., under the Forestry Division of the Department of Agriculture, the Director, and all of the employees of that laboratory would be more than happy and more than willing to extend all of the facilities of the laboratory to this stricken area in its rehabilitation. I do not believe, however, that the people in that particular area, or the Members of Congress representing the various districts of these United States, have a true appreciation of the equipment contained in this laboratory.

This laboratory has developed portable sawmills which could be used in the stricken area at the present time. It has other equipment that could be moved up there. It has technical devices that could be used in the proper handling of all the timber that is down. May I suggest to the Committee and to the House that perhaps a small amount of money included in this \$3,000,000 deficiency appropriation measure be allotted and earmarked for the Forest Products Laboratory, with the idea in mind that their technical help and material assistance be placed on the field immediately.

Mr. Winslow, the Director, has indicated to me he would like to go up there, that he would like to send his men up there and that he would like to have all of the facilities of the laboratory put to work in the above-mentioned stricken area.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did Mr. Winslow speak at the New England council regarding forests?

Mr. HAWKS. He was up there.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think he made very fine recommendations.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Chairman, according to Mr. Winslow's statement, in 1928 and since then there has been recommended for the Forest Products Laboratory an appropriation of \$1,000,000, but never has that amount been appropriated. Last year I believe the sum was \$628,000.

Mr. Chairman, this laboratory needs the million dollars. This is one part of our Government which is performing a real service and I do not hesitate a minute in coming before this House and recommending that the full million dollars asked for by the Department of Agriculture be appropriated to this particular division of the Government. It is performing a service that benefits everyone in this country. It has developed uses for forest products that have proved of value to various people in this country, those interested, for example, in the building game and those who are interested in building homes but find themselves confronted with high costs.

I should like to have the Committee specifically recommend that a part of this \$3,000,000, say at least fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, be earmarked and set aside for the Forest Products Laboratory for use in the particular area at this time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOXEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that

that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2868) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence and to include a statement to the President and the reply by the President on that question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech of Governor James of Pennsylvania. The Public Printer has advised me that this exceeds two and a half pages of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to insert this speech of Governor James, of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in the RECORD, notwithstanding the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman secured an estimate from the Public Printer?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. The Public Printer's estimate is \$112.50.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered in the previous session of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very fine brief presented to the board of hospitalization 2 days ago in favor of a general medical, surgical, and diagnostic center for Boston or the metropolitan area and also to include certain other material in favor of the hospital.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the entire Massachusetts delegation and a number of the Senators and Representatives from other New England States appeared before the board of hospitalization requesting that the board grant money for a hospital at Boston or in the metropolitan area of Boston. For 20 years and over, especially since 1925, Mr. Speaker, I have plead with the Veterans' Administration to build such a hospital in metropolitan Boston. We have the finest medical staff in the entire country, although I appreciate other people have very fine medical men in their districts. We have a tremendously large veteran population. We sent a great many men to the World War and many to the Spanish-American War. Everyone knows the part the old Sixth Regiment played in the Civil War.

Our veterans should be properly cared for with a diagnostic center. We all know that if you have a diagnostic center and a general medical and surgical hospital in connection with a veterans' hospital, staffed by fine physicians, with fine outside consultants, the veterans receive better care and their cases may be service-connected more readily; and it is also true the men do very much better when they are near home.

Also, it is less expensive than sending patients hundreds of miles away for hospitalization outside the State.

I am extremely grateful to Captain Kirby, the legislative counsel of the Disabled American Veterans, who has helped constantly and persistently during the past years in fighting for this hospital. He has represented the Disabled American Veterans, who are, of course, the ones primarily interested in such a hospital.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have also been very helpful and their brief, filed 2 days ago, I believe, with the board of hospitalization, will carry great weight. The American Legion has also been helpful. The brief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Boston, Mass., November 26, 1938.

To All Congressmen and Senators:

If we could only communicate to you our intense interest in the erection of a general medical hospital in Boston, we would have gone far on the road to our objective. Even though on two different occasions we have set forth cold, indisputable facts that buttress our convictions, we want you to know that this is not simply agitation from a veterans' organization; that the facts became known after we had entered on our mission and not the cause of our seeking the establishment of the hospital.

We knew the hospital was and had been needed, and then followed the search to see whether or not Massachusetts could be justified in requesting the location of such a facility here. We feel that we have made out a case for Boston. We express the firm conviction that Massachusetts is entitled to have its program of hospitalization carried out here and any permanent allocation of general medical beds otherwise would bring unsatisfactory results.

The subject is continuously being reexamined and we give you herewith the results of a survey made as of October 1, 1938, of the population of the Veterans' Administration facilities of New England:

	Total patient load	Massa- chusetts	Rhode Island	Maine	New Hamp- shire	Ver- mont	Connect- icut
Bedford.....	1,215	865	105	109	78	11	24 NP
Northampton.....	702	390	49	30	30	45	140 NP
Togus.....	1,042	387	63	224	37	15	57 D
Newington.....	189	19	8	111	15	3	2 GM
Rutland.....	186	46	18	1	9	117	GM
	396	123	10	3	29	1	4 GM
		143	17	13	5	3	86 TB

You will note from these figures that the State with the greatest number of men receiving general medical treatment in any State other than their own is Massachusetts. You will also see that Massachusetts leads in the number of men receiving domiciliary care and they have to go to Maine for that. The ratio of out of State N. P. cases continues so that the Bedford facility is roughly equal to the number of Massachusetts men hospitalized for this disability and consequently the additional number of beds in the Northampton facility is for the hospitalization of veterans from other States—Massachusetts hospitalization in location only.

If we seem to be unduly urging action, it is only because we realize that the time is growing short for arrangements for next year, the regular appropriation bills will be considered by the House Appropriations Committee in December. Surely we can expect that our national representatives will press for a meeting of the Federal board of hospitalization before December 1 of this year, and have the decision of the board on record prior to the hearings on next year's Budget.

Today's headlines:

"Great defense program planned at Washington."

"Mass airplane production, larger Navy, power works due to crisis abroad."

There is contained in these headlines every reason for a general medical hospital in Boston and the last reference to Chelsea being considered as available for veterans in the not too distant future.

We have sought your aid, calling to mind oft-repeated statements we have heard of the importance of our Representatives and Senators in Washington, chairmen of important committees, ranking minority leader, ranking minority Member, important member of Ways and Means Committee, member of powerful Appropriations Committee. All of these, indicative of influence and prestige and to you we entrusted our cause, supported with the best evidence for the Massachusetts disabled soldier, sailor, and marine of quondam service, and so we ask you:

How long are you going to let veterans of western Massachusetts be sent 120 miles to the Bronx hospital in New York for all eye, ear, nose, and throat periods of hospitalization?

How long must western Massachusetts veterans with a service-connected N. P. disability be forced to go to Northampton facility for general medical treatment; Newington not admitting such cases?

How long must Massachusetts men be forced to go to Bronx hospital for cancer treatment and to Tupper Lake, N. Y., for lung operations?

When Boston is the medical center of the United States but not for veterans;

And Massachusetts ranks sixth in the contribution of her sons for World War service;

And Boston is the ninth largest city in the country;

And Massachusetts is eighth among the States in population;

And Massachusetts is thirty-ninth in consideration from the Veterans' Administration for supplying general medical beds under its aegis;

And when is the Federal board going to consider Massachusetts general medical needs?

Yours in comradeship,

THE HOSPITAL FOR BOSTON COMMITTEE.
By FRANCIS X. COTTER, Chairman.

The statement of the Disabled American Veterans and of the American Legion will follow later.

I shall be extremely grateful, and I know the veteran population of all New England will be very grateful to the Members if they will bear this situation in mind if they have an opportunity to speak to the members of the board of hospitalization.

Mr. Speaker, in my work with the veterans and in the work of hospitalization I have never favored one section of the country over another. I believe the veterans of every section should be served. In the matter of a general medical and surgical hospital we have not been given our share. We have no Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital in the great metropolitan district of Boston. I shall be extremely glad to help any and all other Members in securing proper hospitalization for their veterans. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record by printing an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PATRICK, for Friday and Saturday, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 20, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m. Tuesday, January 24, 1939. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 2531—transportation bill. Commissioner Splawn, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is expected to be the first witness.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Public hearings will begin Wednesday morning, February 1, 1939, at 10 a. m., on social security legislation, in the Ways and Means committee room of the New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

294. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the procurement, without advertising, of certain aircraft parts and instruments or aeronautical accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

295. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the purchase of equipment and supplies for experimental and test purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

296. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the disposal of cemetery lots; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

297. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

298. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2868. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2218) for the relief of Mary E. Spinney; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Civil Service.

A bill (H. R. 2672) for the relief of Paul Edmond Beliveau; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 2674) granting a pension to Samuel Harris; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2678) granting a pension to Fordyce Tucker; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2679) for the relief of William Henry Savage; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado:

H. R. 2868. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 2869. A bill to prevent the retroactive application of any Federal tax upon the employees of the States and their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD:

H. R. 2870. A bill to provide for the acquisition of drydock facilities for the United States Maritime Commission at Los Angeles Harbor, in the city and county of Los Angeles, and to authorize the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2871. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of a graving dock at Los Angeles Harbor, in the city and county of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 2872. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than the cost of production; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2873. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for placing educational orders to familiarize private manufacturing establishments with the production of munitions of war of special or technical design, noncommercial in character"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 2874. A bill to provide that pensions otherwise payable for a child of a deceased veteran of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection shall continue until the child reaches the age of 21, where he is attending accredited school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2875. A bill to provide that pensions payable to the widows and orphans of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection shall be effective as of date of death of the veteran, if claim is filed within 1 year thereafter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2876. A bill to provide that the widows and orphans and dependent parents of deceased World War veterans who were suffering with permanent total combat-incurred disabilities shall, regardless of the cause of death, be entitled to the rates of pension which would be payable to them if the veteran had been killed in action in such service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2877. A bill to provide the same privileges for hospitalization and domiciliary care for campaign and expedition veterans as are now applicable to World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 2878. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2879. A bill to amend section 619 of the Revenue Act of 1932; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2880. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. R. 2881. A bill to authorize the use of certain facilities of national parks and national monuments for elementary-school purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAPES:

H. R. 2882. A bill to incorporate the National Society—Army of the Philippines as a body corporate of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARSON:

H. R. 2883. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act (Public, No. 785, 75th Cong.) so as to more adequately define the term "ammunition" as said term is defined in said act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado:

H. R. 2884. A bill to appropriate moneys for construction work on reservoirs on the Rio Grande and Conejos Rivers in Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois:

H. R. 2885. A bill to provide for a term of court at Edwardsville, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 2886. A bill to impose taxes on fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 2887. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence

and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 2888. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2889 (by request). A bill to provide that the widows and orphans of deceased veterans of the Regular Establishment shall be entitled to the same pensions, under the same conditions otherwise, as provided for the widows and orphans of deceased World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2890. A bill to create a division of water pollution control in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 2891. A bill to grant pensions and increases of pensions to widows and children and other dependents of veterans who died as a result of injury or disease incurred in, or aggravated by, active military or naval service in the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 2892. A bill to provide uniform reciprocal hospitalization in any Army or Navy hospital for retired personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2893. A bill to remove discriminations against retired Army enlisted personnel and to equalize hospitalization and domiciliary benefits of retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2894. A bill to readjust the allowances of retired enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 2895. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1938 (Public, No. 761), authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 2896. A bill to readjust the allowances of retired enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2897. A bill to equalize the pensions payable to the dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment with those payable to dependents of veterans of the World War whose death is due to service; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H. R. 2898 (by request). A bill to reclassify salaries of employees in the custodial service of the Post Office Department and in the custodial service of the Treasury Department of the United States, including all positions therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

H. R. 2899. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver, issue silver certificates, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, 9 p. m., known as the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DARDEN:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 127, Seventy-fifth Congress; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Thomas E. Watson for his services in the origination of Rural Free Delivery Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HILL:

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9 as Leif Ericson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of April 17 to 23, 1939, as National Humane Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray the story of aviation; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to provide for the purchase and sale of timber in the New England hurricane-stricken area; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con Res. 5. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 2, on Investigation of Un-American Activities and Propaganda; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. Con Res. 6. Concurrent resolution authorizing the holding of ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the presentation of a statue of the late Will Rogers; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. Res. 62. Resolution authorizing the payment of mileage for each clerk to each Representative or Delegate in Congress during the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. Res. 63. Resolution authorizing a select committee to investigate the interstate migration of destitute citizens; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 2900. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of David T. Beck; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2901. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Geraldine Ash; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Eugene Jacob Steiner; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 2903. A bill for the relief of Jake C. Aaron and Thomas W. Carter, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of Peter Koutsaymanes; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2905. A bill for the relief of Edmund L. Moore; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2906. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma E. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2907. A bill granting an increase of pension to Addie Webster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2908. A bill granting an increase of pension to Arzila A. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2909. A bill granting an increase of pension to C. Cordella Strong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2910. A bill granting an increase of pension to Louisa C. Ludwig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2911. A bill granting an increase of pension to Forrest E. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2912. A bill granting an increase of pension to Phoebe C. Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2913. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jennie Bean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2914. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Luella McEwen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2915. A bill granting an increase of pension to Maryette Vannatta; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2916. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Norwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2917. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma S. Dolaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARDEN:

H. R. 2918. A bill granting a pension to Arthur Leonard Wadsworth 3d; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Marie K. Trottnow; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2920. A bill for the relief of Paul Lindley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWELL:

H. R. 2921. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Westlake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 2922. A bill for the relief of Owen J. Doherty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARTER of New York:

H. R. 2923. A bill granting a pension to Emil J. Dahlman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2924. A bill granting a pension to Cora Rodell Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IGLESIAS:

H. R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Julia Santiago; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 2926. A bill for the relief of Bernard Woodruff; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 2927. A bill granting an increase of pension to America E. Dye; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 2928. A bill for the relief of Anton Kostiuk (Anthony Kostiuk); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MYERS:

H. R. 2929. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2930. A bill for the relief of the estate of Morris Farash; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PIERCE of New York:

H. R. 2931. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Lent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2932. A bill for the relief of Claud Mead; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2933. A bill for the relief of Oscar O. Taylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2934. A bill granting a pension to Jacob J. Short; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2935. A bill for the relief of Hunter C. Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 2936. A bill granting a pension to James A. G. Livingston; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2937. A bill granting a pension to Alfred Arrowood; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2938. A bill for the relief of James A. Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2939. A bill for the relief of M. F. Powers; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 2940. A bill for the relief of W. S. Rosenbalm; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2941. A bill granting a pension to Martha Samsel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2942. A bill granting a pension to Dona Samples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois:

H. R. 2943. A bill for the relief of Jos. Greenspon's Son Pipe Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2944. A bill for the relief of Jerome Scalione; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2945. A bill for the relief of certain persons for obtaining purchase options on real estate in slum-clearance and low-cost housing projects in East St. Louis, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 2946. A bill for the relief of Naoma Kinder, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2947. A bill for the relief of the West Virginia Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 2948. A bill for the relief of Morris Hoppenheim, Lena Hoppenheim, Doris Hoppenheim, and Ruth Hoppenheim; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 2949. A bill granting a pension to Jennie Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 2950. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Samuel F. Swayne; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2951. A bill directing the payment to William H. Carter of travel allowances from Manila, P. I., to San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNGDAHL:

H. R. 2952. A bill granting a pension to Henry J. Esch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

301. By Mr. BALL: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Durham, Conn., urging the enactment of legislation to prevent, as far as possible, the advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

302. Also, petition of certain citizens of Stonington, Conn., having reference to the general policy of neutrality to be pursued by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

303. Also, petitions of citizens of Rockville, and citizens of Jewett City, all of the State of Connecticut, requesting that we adhere to the general policy of neutrality now in force in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

304. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of the citizens of Monroe, Wis., and vicinity, requesting that we adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

305. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of the Neuaukum Home Grange, No. 622, Enumclaw, Wash., Mrs. L. C. Fant, secretary, Auburn, Wash., pointing out that the agriculture crisis continues; that dairy farmers in western Washington are badly hit; that farmers generally are faced with foreclosure and in such cases would be compelled to go on relief; that in view of agricultural conditions generally it is urged that Congress pass an act to suspend payments on the principal farm loans as was done up to last year; that such suspension continue until such time as the agricultural situation improves; to the Committee on Agriculture.

306. By Mr. DeROUEN: Petition of the St. Joseph's Holy Name Society, Ponchatoula, La., protesting against the lifting of the so-called Spanish embargo and urging the adherence by the United States to its present neutrality policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

307. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of Lewis E. Keith and others of Swampscott, Mass., urging that the Dies committee be reappointed to continue its investigation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

308. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association, Fitchburg, Mass., to prevent the retroactive application of any Federal taxes upon the employees of the States and their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

309. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Catholic Order of Foresters, Boston, Mass., opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

310. Also, petition of the Clare Circle, No. 69, National Circle, Daughters of Isabella, Whitinsville, Mass., opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

311. Also, petition of the Court St. Jude, No. 1123, Catholic Daughters of America, Charlestown, Mass., opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

312. Also, petition of the Scandinavian Workers League of America, Boston, opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

313. By Mr. FULMER: Resolution submitted by Julian Wolfe, David Doar, and Clyde Fair, committee on behalf of Thomas Raysor Summers Post, No. 4, American Legion, Orangeburg, S. C., urging that Representatives in the National Congress be requested to pass such legislation as will better protect the people of this Nation, and at the same time have on hand enough of the latest type firearms and munitions so that should another war come upon us this country will be in a better position to protect its property and its citizens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

314. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of Reynolds, Ind., and vicinity, submitting a declaration of policy on the subject of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

315. Also, petition of members of All Saints Church, San Pierre, Ind., submitting a declaration of policy on the subject of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

316. Also, petitions of citizens of Star City, Lafayette, and North Judson, Ind., submitting a declaration of policy in respect to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

317. Also, petition of citizens of Kewanna, Ind., submitting a declaration of policy in respect to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

318. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of 149 residents of Wichita, Kans., and vicinity, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts, for as long as we shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

319. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Grace Fitzgerald and other residents of Sheffield, Pa., asking Congress to adhere to the general policy of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

320. By Mr. JOHNS: Petition of the Reverend J. A. Szuprijl and 82 other residents of Peshtigo, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

321. Also, petition of Dr. N. J. McLaughlin and 19 other residents of Wrightstown, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

322. Also, petition of Roscoe T. Page and sundry citizens of Appleton, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United

States to retain provisions of the Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937, and also to retain the embargo on arms and to investigate leftist and communistic groups in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

323. Also, petition of the St. Ann's congregation and 16 other residents of Francis Creek, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

324. Also, petition of Rev. John H. Huhn and 44 other residents of Luxemburg, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

325. Also, petition of Judge G. H. Crowns and the signatures of 18 residents of Kewaunee, Wis., urging adherence to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

326. Also, petition of Frank Schmitt and 19 other residents of Greenleaf, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

327. Also, petition of the Reverend Vincent Cottam, pastor of the St. Mary of the Lake Catholic Church, Baileys Harbor, Wis., and 19 other citizens of Baileys Harbor, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

328. Also, petition of the Reverend H. A. Littel and 219 other residents of Green Bay, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; and to keep the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

329. Also, petition of Joe Gunschevich and 19 other residents of Combined Locks, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and as amended in the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

330. Also, petition of the Reverend L. C. Becker and 19 other citizens of Oconto, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended in the act of May 1, 1937, to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

331. Also, petition of John Goodland, Jr., mayor, and 29 other residents of Appleton, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

332. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Telegram from the American Federation of Musicians, Local 802, New York City, urging support for adequate appropriations for the arts and Federal theater projects in New York City; to the Committee on Appropriations.

333. Also, petition of the Walnut Hill Realty Corporation, New York City, concerning the Patman chain-store bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

334. Also, petition of the Loyal Order of Moose, Borough Hall Lodge, No. 222, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Dies investigating committee; to the Committee on Rules.

335. By Mr. KINZER: Petitions of 39 citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., setting forth a declaration of policy on the subject of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

336. Also, petition of certain citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., urging consideration of a petition with reference to advertising and the sale of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

337. Also, petition of certain citizens of Marietta, Pa., protesting against any change in our neutrality laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

338. Also, petition of the faculty and students of Immaculata College, in the Tenth District of Pennsylvania, protesting against any change in our neutrality laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

339. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition of the members of the Woman's Missionary Society of the Market Square Presbyterian Church, of Harrisburg, favoring the retention of the embargo on munitions to countries engaged in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

340. By Mr. LEAVY: Petition of the Four County Council, composed of commercial organizations of Grant, Okanogan, Douglas, and Chelan Counties, of the State of Washington, expressing the opposition of this group to the proposed establishment of a national park in the Cascade Range, it being contended that there is already set aside in the State of Washington adequate areas for park and recreational facilities and that it would not be in the best interests of the State to preclude development of mineral, timber, water power, grazing, and hunting resources in that area; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

341. By Mr. LESINSKI: Petition of the residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Michigan favoring the policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of Congress of August 31, 1935, and also the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

342. Also, petition of the members of the Holy Name Society of the Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Oakwood Boulevard, Detroit, Mich., opposing the lifting of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

343. Also, resolution of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., opposing taxation of State and municipal securities by the Federal Government without consent of the State, and urging support of legislation prohibiting retroactive Federal taxation of salaries of State and municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

344. Also, petition of the International Association of Fire Fighters, Local Union No. 356, Wyandotte, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to preventing the retroactive application of any Federal tax upon the employees of the States and their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

345. Also, resolution of Wyandotte Council, No. 1802, Knights of Columbus, urging the continuation of the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities and sufficient appropriation to enable the committee to function and perform its services; to the Committee on Rules.

346. Also, resolution of the State, County, and Municipal Workers Local 79, Detroit, Mich., opposing any amendment to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

347. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of the citizens of Clyde, Ohio, urging adherence to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retaining on our statute books the further and corollary act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

348. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Hugh L. Garrity and sundry citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging Congress to adhere to the general

policy of neutrality enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain the further and corollary principle of the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

349. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the St. Joan of Arc's Holy Name Society, of Jackson Heights, resolving that this society respectfully demand of the Congress of the United States to continue its policy of strict neutrality on behalf of the people of this Nation and to prevent the exportation of arms from this country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

350. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of Mrs. Charles Cross and eight other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

351. Also, petition of John P. McCotter and 23 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

352. Also, petition of Louise Owens and 23 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

353. Also, petition of Robert Burkett and 19 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

354. Also, petition of Mrs. T. Powers and 17 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

355. Also, petition of H. J. Binck, Jr., and 18 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

356. Also, petition of John A. Moos and 35 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

357. Also, petition of Mary J. O'Connor and 20 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the neutrality acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

358. By Mr. RICH: Petition of citizens of Kane, Pa., favoring the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

359. By Mr. SANDAGER: Memorial of the members of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish, Providence, R. I., urging maintenance of the embargo on munition shipments to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

360. By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois: Petition of parishoners of St. Elizabeth's parish, East St. Louis, Ill., calling upon Congress to retain on the statute books the Neutrality Act of May 1, 1937, and extend its provisions to include civil and international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

361. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the Marion-Taylor Chapter, of the Department of West Virginia, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Fairmont, W. Va., favoring the continuation of hearings on un-American activities by the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

362. By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Petition of Rev. T. A. Rankin and 75 citizens of Virginia, protesting against the lifting of the Spanish embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

363. By Mr. THORKELOSON: Petition of the State wheat committee (Montana), petitioning Congress to appropriate a total of \$6,000,000 for the control of insects of regional importance, which appropriation shall be administered by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, of the Department of Agriculture; and that said appropriation be made in sufficient time so that proper preparations can be made for the control program this spring; to the Committee on Appropriations.

364. Also, petition of the Northern Montana Development Association, requesting that there be no acreage control applied to the production of sugar beets; that the production of sugar beets be encouraged in all areas where the crop may be produced successfully in order to divert acreage of surplus producing crops, such as wheat, cotton, corn, and tobacco; and urging adequate sugar-beet legislation that will permit the further development of the irrigation resources of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture.

365. Also, petition of the Lions Club of Libby, Mont., requesting that the parts of the act of March 4, 1907, and the act of August 24, 1912, which prevent the President from making changes in the national forests of Montana, be repealed to enable an extension of the Kootenai National Forest to include the Kootenai Canyon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

366. Also, petition of the county commissioners of Beaverhead County, Mont., requesting the enactment of a work relief law to divert labor back to private industry and relieve the present relief rolls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

367. Also, petition of the Butte branch of the American Association of University Women, requesting revision of the neutrality law in certain respects; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

368. Also, petition of the Helena Teamsters Union, Local No. 666, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, protesting against the modification of the National Labor Relations Act and favoring increase of the annual appropriation for enforcement of the act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

369. Also, petition of the Northeast Montana Production Credit Association, requesting that the farm bill be amended or a new bill be passed establishing a bushelage quota for farmer-producers, with a set parity price for wheat based on 12-percent protein; to the Committee on Agriculture.

370. Also, petition of the Cascade County Trades and Labor Assembly, opposing any modification in the National Labor Relations Act, and petitioning an increased appropriation to carry on the work; to the Committee on Labor.

371. Also, petition of the Northern Montana Development Association, requesting an increase of the appropriation for the insect (grasshopper) control work of the Bureau of Entomology to \$6,000,000; to the Committee on Agriculture.

372. Also, petition of the Farm Rate Council, of Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, suggesting certain provisions involving production of farm rates and coordination of railroad facilities in proposed railroad legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

373. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of Rev. John E. O'Connor and others, of Altoona, Pa., urging adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts of August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

374. Also, petition of Altoona Council 551, Knights of Columbus, of Altoona, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

375. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Albert A. Greiner, of Altoona, Pa., urging United States adherence to the Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on our statute books the further and corollary act to include civil as well as international conflicts, urging Congress to launch an investigation of those leftist groups which are sponsoring propaganda favoring lifting of the embargo on arms to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

376. By Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Petition of M. Louise Lavalla, Financier Council No. 3471, the Security Benefit Association, Buhl, Idaho, urging the passage of an amendment to the Social Security Act, exempting subordinate councils or lodges of fraternal benefit societies and their officers from the provisions of the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

377. By the SPEAKER: Petition of St. Anthony's Church, Joliet, Ill., protesting against the lifting of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

378. Also, petition of A. P. Robert, Marquette, Mich., petitioning in favor of neutrality and keeping the embargo on Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

379. Also, petition of John Cappio, Sr., Philadelphia, Pa., urging consideration of a petition with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

380. Also, petition of Mrs. Matilde A. Wild, Clarion, Pa., petitioning the keeping of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

381. Also, petition of John Kish, Elrama, Pa., and others, petitioning the keeping of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

382. Also, petition of the Women's National Democratic Club, Inc., New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution adopted January 15, 1939, with reference to an elective third term; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1939

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 17, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, January 19, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	La Follette	Russell
Andrews	Ellender	Lee	Schwartz
Ashurst	Frazier	Lewis	Schwellenbach
Austin	George	Lodge	Sheppard
Bailey	Gerry	Logan	Shipstead
Bankhead	Gibson	Lucas	Smithers
Barbour	Gillette	Lundeen	Smith
Barkley	Glass	McCarran	Stewart
Bilbo	Green	McKellar	Taft
Bone	Guffey	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Gurney	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Hale	Mead	Tobey
Bulow	Harrison	Miller	Townsend
Burke	Hatch	Minton	Truman
Byrd	Hayden	Murray	Tydings
Byrnes	Herring	Neely	Vandenberg
Capper	Hill	Norris	Van Nuys
Caraway	Holman	Nye	Wagner
Chavez	Holt	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	White
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	Wiley
Danaher	King	Reed	
Davis		Reynolds	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is detained from the Senate because of illness. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] is detained on important public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF PAUL Y. ANDERSON AND RODNEY DUTCHER

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, since the final adjournment of the Seventy-fifth Congress Messrs. Paul Y. Anderson and Rodney Dutcher, who were long distinguished, respected, and